00065012

480
Ham/Sab
65012.

THE
ASIATIC SOCIETY OF BOMBAY
Town Hall, Bombay.

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 23 January, 2019

THE

SUBJUNCTIVE

OF THE

GREEKS AND LATINS.

WITH AN APPENDIX ON Μή.

BY 65012
a.c

GAVIN HAMILTON,

OF THE ELGIN ACADEMY,

AUTHOR OF THE "FUNCTIONS OF SI AND QUI," "THE LOGIC OF THE LATIN LANGUAGE," ETC. ETC.

Opinionis commenta delet dies; confirmat judicia rationis.

Εχει ἡ Δίκη μέγα σθένος.

EDINBURGH:

OLIVER AND BOYD, TWEEDDALE COURT.

LONDON: SIMPKIN, MARSHALL, AND CO.

1867.

00065012

TO

SCOTTISH SCHOLARS,

THE COUNTRYMEN OF GEORGE BUCHANAN,

THIS WORK IS DEDICATED

BY THEIR FAITHFUL SERVANT,

THE AUTHOR.

INTRODUCTION.

THERE are those who believe that the Germans are in general the most correct thinkers and the clearest expositors in the world. It is neither the desire nor the design of the author to invade the security of their belief. It is with the Germans only as expositors of the syntax of the Greek and Latin languages that he has to do, and it does not consist with his method to travel beyond the record. He has ventured to dispute their reputed classical infallibility; and in his philological journey to Rome and Athens, he has not gone by Germany, lest, peradventure, he might lose himself in a German fog. As a preliminary postulate in the process of his argument, he has assumed that the Greeks and Latins knew how to use their own tongue. He has been quite content to allow them to go first. There is nothing which he has deprecated more than dogmatism. In everything dogmatism is offensive, but in Latin, especially, it is as offensive as puppyism itself. He has no opinion of his own on the subject, save

that the opinion of the ancient Greeks and Latins on the use of their native speech should prevail against the foreign theories of modern Germans. He has not adopted the German practice of "evolving theories from the depths of his own consciousness," for he has had a fear that afterwards it might be proved that they were only evolved from the shallows of his own conceit. Nor has it been deemed necessary or desirable to invent a theory for the subjunctive, or Μή, since the *rationale* of the practice of the Greeks and Latins could be ascertained by a careful study of their works. The ancient Greeks and Latins knew little about the transcendental sense, but they knew a great deal about common sense. In contrasting the simple practice of the ancient Greeks and Latins with the transcendental theories of the modern Germans, and in reporting progress in the shape of positive results, for the future guidance of the student, the author prefers using language other than his own. It is not desirable to make the review through the magnifying glass of egotism.

The following is the theory of the German Grotefend relating to the conditional subjunctive, circulated far and wide through Britain, in the well-known school-books of Kerchever Arnold, without exciting remonstrance or even remark:—"A supposition may be so stated as either to imply nothing with respect to the speaker's opinion, or, on the other hand, to convey with it some intimation that it is in his

judgment possible, probable, etc. When '*si*' *carries with it no such intimation, it governs the indicative; when it does carry any intimation of the kind, it governs the subjunctive.*"

The author, elsewhere, having dealt with this theory in detail, has received attestations relative to it from the subjoined academic authorities:—

"I certainly think the canon of Grotefend relative to the subjunctive cannot stand."—Professor Jowett, the University, Oxford.

"I entirely agree with you as to *si*."—Professor Blackie, the University, Edinburgh.

"Regarding your assault on the canon of Grotefend, relating to the subjunctive, I think decidedly you are victorious."—Professor Geddes, the University, Aberdeen.

To these is to be added the authentic declaration of the author's late lamented friend and teacher, Professor W. Ramsay, the University, Glasgow:—"There can be no doubt that Grotefend's rule on *si* is altogether wrong, and that your principle is correct."

So much for the German theory of the conditional subjunctive.

Progress has next to be reported as to the German theory of incorporated subjunctive clauses. The late Professor Zumpt of Berlin thus wrote:—

"(A.) The subjunctive is used in clauses where they form an essential part of the statement implied in the accusative with the infinitive (p. 392). (B.)

Clauses introduced into a proposition which is expressed by the subjunctive when they are to be considered as an essential part of the leading proposition (p. 393). Memoria erat tanta (Hortensius) quantam in nullo cognovisse me arbitror, *ut quae secum commentatus esset*, ea sine scripto verbis eisdem redderet, quibus *cogitavisset.*"—Cic., *Brut.* 88, Schmitz's Edition.

The German Krüger, following faithfully in the footsteps of his predecessor, quoting the now notorious memoria erat tanta, etc., wrote, moreover:—"Such clauses usually have the verb in the subjunctive, even when they express what might be conceived as independent of anybody's thought."

Dr Schmitz, himself a German, writing in English, follows faithfully the footsteps of his countrymen, and quotes the now still more notorious *memoria* erat *tanta*, etc.—Lat. Gr., p. 269.

Professor Key of London has adopted the theory of the Germans to the full, but as if he had really apprehended a principle, and had applied it, ventures to quote an example of his own.—Lat. Gr., p. 318.

Dr Kennedy of Shrewsbury, a famous composer, and a famous trainer of famous composers, presents the theory in a Latin shape (Gr., p. 129), and, following faithfully in the footsteps of the Germans, quotes, as an illustrative instance of its truth, the now still more notorious *memoria* erat *tanta*, etc.

Professor Madvig of Copenhagen, a Dane, follow-

ing faithfully in the footsteps of the German Zumpt, adopts the theory, quoting the now still more notorious *memoria* erat *tanta*, etc. Of the other writings of Professor Madvig, the author knows nothing, and therefore will say nothing; but when we judge him by what he has written on the subjunctive and on Μή, we are not judging Manlius in sight of the Capitol. As for Zumpt, the Ζεὺς μέγας of the German classical Olympus, his extraordinary European ascendency is proved by the adoption of his canons by these scholars. After these canons were dealt with in detail by the author elsewhere, one who was a Fellow of Oriel College, Oxford, who has taught in three of the four Scottish Universities, Professor W. Young Sellar, thus wrote to him :—

"The canons you impugn are clearly wrong."

The author, moreover, ventured to remark that Zumpt, though he gave laws to Europe on the Latin language, was a man of extraordinary industry, rather than a man of extraordinary intellect. After writing this, it was thus that Professor W. Hepworth Thompson of Cambridge wrote to him :—

"Your judgment of Zumpt is correct."

This is a memorable illustration of the danger of taking a theory on trust rather than on trial, and of circulating canons "which are clearly wrong." For at whatever mental mint they may have been coined, however long they may have been circulated, though they may have passed from Berlin to Copen-

hagen, from Copenhagen to London, from London to Edinburgh, wanting the genuine stamp of truth, they are sure to be discovered to be only counterfeit. It is right that this large draft on credulity should now stand dishonoured. Here another instance illustrative of this custom indicating motion, but no progress, of running in conventional ruts, of repeating and registering what has been received from others, without asking and ascertaining whether it is right, must be given. It proves that the "appropriation clause" is as familiar to philologists as to politicians, and justifies the inimitable irony of Pascal:—

"Certain authors, speaking of their works, say 'my book, my commentary, my history.' It were better to say 'our book, our history, our commentary;' for generally there is more in it belonging to others than to themselves."

In the Latin Lexicons of Freund, Andrews, White, Dr W. Smith of London, on the word *adductus*, is given what purports to be a quotation from Suetonius:—"Adductus vultus qui gravitatis vel etiam tristitiae signum est."—Lib. 68.

All that Suetonius gives is *adducto vultu;* the rest is the Latin explanation of *Forcellini*, which has been mistaken for the text of Suetonius. These lexicographers, however, in repeating and registering the blunders of each other, have, according to the classical critic of the *Glamorganshire Gazette*, shown "good taste," for he censured the author at the commencement of his philological investigations for

"bad taste" in differing from those who had gone before him. According to the classical critic of the *Glamorganshire Gazette*, the receipt for a wise man is to agree with what everybody says; and Galileo, who differed from others in proving that the earth went round the sun, and not the sun round the earth, must have been a foolish man. It is fair, however, to state that the classical critic of the *Glamorganshire Gazette*, towards whom the most kindly feeling is cherished here, after finding that the new doctrines, "though differing from others," are the old doctrines of the Greeks and Romans, has ceased to inflict his grave censure.

But it is time to report further progress. Professor Sellar, at his appointment to the chair of Latin in the University of Edinburgh in 1863, thus wrote:—

"The highest teaching of the classical languages, considered simply as languages, may be said to have advanced as far as it can advance. It may almost be doubted whether, if it were possible, it would be desirable to refine on it any further."

At that time, in every complete Latin grammar in Europe, the student was told that the "Subjunctive was used in the first clause because it was indirect; in the second clause, because it was indefinite; in the third clause, because it was dependent; in the fourth clause, because it was potential; in the fifth clause, because the predicate was in the relative clause; in the sixth clause, because it was an

essential part of the entire statement; in the seventh clause, because it was doubtful; in the eighth clause, because the supposition carries with it some intimation that in the speaker's judgment it is probable; in the ninth clause, because it is an act of indefinite frequency; and in the tenth clause, because it is a supposition, and not a fact."

In 1866, the author received a communication from the Metropolitan Professor of Latin himself, to the following effect:—

"I agree with you that these theories are unsatisfactory."

A year before that, he had received from one,—ere yet he had the honour and happiness of his personal acquaintance,—who is at once the successor of Porson and Whewell, and worthy of either, the Professor of Greek and Master of Trinity College, Cambridge, who, in his notes on the *Ancient Philosophy* of Archer Butler, has rivalled the acuteness and learning of the late Sir W. Hamilton,—the following assurance:—

"By liberating the province of grammar from these intruders—technical terms—you will have done a good work, and scholars who have not committed themselves to a theory will be grateful to you."

Those anonymous writers, who, unable to answer the new arguments, sought to revenge themselves by reviling their author with a meanness and malignity seldom paralleled, will at last have found, if they have not felt that they have been doing a bad and

base thing in bearing false witness against their neighbour, that they have been doing a very foolish thing. They themselves have only precipitated what they vainly sought to prevent.

But it is not till these theories of this hitherto mysterious and multifarious mood, as unlike each other as the angle of polarization or the electric telegraph, are like trees tried and tested by their fruits, that their true nature appears. It is thus that Mr Long, late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, editor of Cicero in the *British Bibliotheca Græca*, adopting the theory, last on the above list, applies it. After condemning the reading *pervenirent* in Cæsar (*B. G.* i. 53), simply because it contradicts his theory, he interprets, Neque prius fugere destiterunt quam ad flumen *pervenerunt*, "They did not stop till they reached the river, till that *fact* was *accomplished*." The reading *pervenirent* would as infallibly have indicated that the fact was accomplished as the reading *pervenerunt*, as will soon be seen. Another late Fellow of Trinity, one much more distinguished, one of European as well as English repute, the late lamented Dr Donaldson, but oftener than once misled by foreign theorists, and on this very subject (*Latin Gr.*, p. 152), says, "*Quam* has the subjunctive when the preceding event is in some sort supposed the cause of the subsequent." Livy, when called into court in defence of his native speech, says:—

Ipse diem quidem servavit, sed paulo antequam sol *occideret* venit.—i. 50.

Thus, according to Dr Donaldson, the arrival of

Tarquinius was the "cause of the setting of the sun;" according to Mr Long, it "did not set at all," *occideret* expressing a "mere conception," not "an accomplished fact." It is hardly necessary to add that theories, involving such violations of experience and common sense, cannot be true.

As to the German theories of the Greek subjunctive, nothing will be said against them here; but after it is indicated what they are, and what is the practice of the ancient Greeks themselves, let whoever will say anything for them. The name of Kühner is here clearly entitled to the preference, for the Oxford publisher, Parker, says, "His grammar is now in general use, at Oxford, Cambridge, Dublin, and Durham, at Eton, King's College, London, and most other public schools."

At p. 78, vol. ii., it is stated that the "subjunctive, in all its persons, is used to express a question implying doubt." At p. 470, id., it is stated further that the "subjunctive gives a *certain*, the optative only a probable result." Thus the student who desires to know for "certain without doubt" what the subjunctive means, is told at one time that it expresses "doubt," at another time "certainty."

Further, at p. 502, the student is told, "Thus the subjunctive may be considered to express an *indefinite frequency, as often as.*" In the first treatise put into the hands of schoolboys, Xenophon says:—

ὁ δ' ὑπέσχετο, ἀνδρὶ ἑκάστῳ δώσειν πέντε ἀργυρίου μνᾶς, ἐπὰν εἰς Βαβυλῶνα ἥκωσι.—*An.* i. 4, 13.

As the whole world knows, the Greeks, in that celebrated expedition, only once came to Babylon.

Herodotus, the father of history, writes:—

ἡ δὲ Πυθίη οἱ χρᾷ τάδε.

Ἀλλ' ὅτ' ἂν ἡμίονος βασιλεὺς Μηδόισι γένηται.—i. 55.

But the modern Germans interpret, "the appointment of a mule as a monarch over men is an act of indefinite *frequency*."

Natural history receives as ludicrous illustration as profane history at the hands of the Germans:—

Τότε γὰρ αἱρήσετε ἡμέας, ἐπεὰν ἡμίονοι τέκωσι.

—*Herod.* iii. 150.

Old Homer, as orthodox as he is old, says:—

Ἥ θέμις ἐστὶ γυναικός, ἐπὴν πόσις ἄλλοθ' ὄληται.

Od. xiv. 130.

And the Bible, best of books, says:—

"It is appointed unto men once to die,"

but the modern Germans represent the death of the same man as an act of "indefinite frequency."

It will be observed that among the places indicated above, as admitting and adopting the German theories of Kühner, Scotland is conspicuous by its absence. It is to be hoped that here these theories will terminate their travels.

Thus, while an essential unity underlies all the usages of the Greek and Latin subjunctive, the Germans, after an imperfect and partial induction, have confounded an occasional and accidental adjunct with an essential property, and been led to conclusions contradicted by history, experience, and

common sense. This is equally certain and conspicuous in the case of Μή. Here, too, the German theory of Hermann and Kühner has been adopted by the late Dr Donaldson, Arnold, and the Oxford lexicographers. The practice of later writers, Plutarch and Lucian seeming on this point to militate against this theory, Professor Madvig of Copenhagen has invented and introduced "the usus ethicus" to conciliate conflicting claims. Of this it may be said what Professor Hepworth Thompson has said of subjective and objective,—"Here grammarians try to help us with their *nostrum* of subjective and objective, but to little purpose." Others, themselves foreigners, with the audacity peculiar to thoroughgoing theorists, allege that Plutarch and Lucian, while writing their own language, "wrote bad Greek." It turns out that Plutarch and Lucian wrote precisely as Demosthenes, Sophocles, and Thucydides. Only the testimony of that great thinker, Thucydides, may be cited here. By the theory in question, the Peloponnesian war becomes, like the Trojan war, "a hypothesis," and Pericles, himself its conductor, "a myth." According to it, *τοῦ πολέμου μὴ γενομένου* essentially means, "if the war did not exist." But Thucydides has written :—

ἠβούλοντο τὴν Πλάταιαν ἀεὶ σφίσι διάφορον οὖσαν ἔτι ἐν εἰρήνῃ τε καὶ τοῦ πολέμου μήπω φανεροῦ καθεστῶτος προκαταλαβεῖν.—ii. 2.

And Mr Pitt, who, it is well known, was well acquainted with "that eternal manual of statesmen,"

would never have interpreted it, "if the war had not taken place." Indeed, any schoolboy of average ability, if not perverted by German theories, would translate "before the war had broken out." If he did not, most masters would be of the same mind as the late Lord Macaulay, when putting down J. Wilson Croker, who had set up as a classical critic:—

"Indeed, the decisions of this editor on points of classical learning, though pronounced in a very authoritative tone, are generally such, that if a schoolboy under our care were to utter them, our soul assuredly should not spare for his crying."—*Essays*, vol. i. 359.

It is neither necessary nor desirable to say more. When a lawyer has facts on his side, he states his case, and lets the facts speak for themselves. Against the iron force of facts, it is as vain to fight as to fight against fate itself.

THE ACADEMY, ELGIN,
22*d June* 1867.

THE SUBJUNCTIVE OF THE GREEKS.

I. Ἐπάν, ἐπειδάν, ETC., WITH THE SUBJUNCTIVE.

THERE is a theory which represents the subjunctive mood as that of "indefinite frequency."

"Thus the conjunctive may be considered to express an indefinite frequency, *as often as*."—Kühner, by *Jelf*, vol. ii. p. 502.

It would also appear, further, that this theory has been coined in Germany, and circulated in this country. It is proposed in this treatise to take the theory on trial, rather than on trust. Theories like trees ought to be tested by their fruits. The test to try the theory of the modern Germans is taken from the ancient Greeks. The first proof cited is furnished by a treatise read by schoolboys rather than by students:—

ὁ δ' ὑπέσχετο, ἀνδρὶ ἑκάστῳ δώσειν πέντε ἀργυρίου μνᾶς, ἐπὰν εἰς Βαβυλῶνα ἥκωσι.—*Anab.* i. 4, 13.

It was neither the custom in ancient Greece, nor is it so probably in modern Germany, that men should agree themselves, or be asked by others, to

complete their contract oftener than once. History and common sense alike show that the soldiers of Cyrus once, and once only, came to Babylon. The ancient Greeks, who surely knew how to use their own tongue, when wishing to make precise specifications as to time, place, and persons, used the subjunctive for that purpose—ἐπὰν ἥκωσι. The modern Germans, however, though foreigners, represent the subjunctive mood as that of "indefinite frequency."

Another sentence similar to the preceding is to be found in the second book of the Anabasis. The precise style of expression peculiar to contracts is exemplified by the employment of the subjunctive:—

Νῦν μὲν δὴ ἄπειμι ὡς βασιλέα· ἐπειδὰν δὲ διαπράξωμαι ἃ δέομαι, ἥξω.—*Cap.* iii. 29.

Here ἐπειδὰν does not mean "as often as," but *as soon as;* and as such, with the subjunctive, is quite fatal to the German theory which represents it as the mood of "indefinite frequency."

There is a third sentence even more precise in the third book of the same treatise:—

εἶπε δέ, ὅτι, ἐπειδὰν τάχιστα ἡ στρατεία λήξῃ εὐθὺς ἀποπέμψειν αὐτόν.—*Cap.* i. 9.

Here a single specific act is indicated with all the precision of which language is capable, and that too with the subjunctive—ἐπειδὰν τάχιστα λήξῃ.

So clear, so consistent, so complete is the evidence given by the first witness called into court—an ancient Greek—in defence of his native language, against the modern theory of foreign Germans. Herodotus, the

father of history, furnishes facts equally fatal with those of Xenophon to this theory:—

ἡ δὲ Πυθίη οἱ χρᾷ τάδε·
Ἀλλ' ὅτ' ἂν ἡμίονος βασιλεὺς Μήδοισι γένηται.—i. 55.

Surely the appointment of a mule, as king over men, cannot be an act of "frequency" either indefinite or definite. The following instance from the same author places this idea of "frequency" in a light still more ludicrous:—

Τότε γὰρ αἰχήσετε ἡμέας, ἐπεὰν ἡμίονοι τέκωσι.—*Thal.* 150.

Here, if we are to believe the Germans, the procreation of their species by mules is represented as an act of "frequency." Naturalists say No. There would be as much truth in a declaration by the Germans that the arrival of the Greek Kalends is an act of "indefinite frequency." Early Greek writers have no countenance to give to this doctrine. The father of Greek poetry furnishes facts as fatal to the Germans as the father of history:—

Τοῦ δ' ἀγαθοῦ οὔτ' ἄρ τρέπεται χρώς, οὔτε τι λίην
Ταρβεῖ, ἐπειδὰν πρῶτον ἐσίζηται λόχον ἀνδρῶν.
—*Il.* xiii. 285.

Here Homer represents an act as taking place for the *first* time by means of the subjunctive—πρῶτον ἐσίζηται. Of course, this precise specification excludes altogether the existence of such an idea as "indefiniteness." Another passage containing the same precise specification by means of the subjunctive is to be found in the nineteenth book:—

εὖτ' ἂν πρῶτον ὁμιλήσωσι φάλαγγες
Ἀνδρῶν.—159.

In the three following passages Homer refers to a very remarkable event—the sack of Troy—and represents it as occurring only once, by means of the subjunctive:—

Ἔσσεται ἦμαρ ὅτ' ἄν ποτ' ὀλώλῃ Ἴλιος ἱρή.—*Il.* iv. 166.

Ἔσσεται ἦμαρ ὅτ ἄν ποτ' ὀλώλῃ Ἴλιος ἱρή.—vi. 448.

Μηδ' ὁπότ' ἂν Τροίη μαλερῷ πυρὶ πᾶσα δάηται.—xxi. 375.

If there be any truth in the German theory, the sack of Troy was an act of "indefinite frequency," recurring from time to time during the ten years' siege. The Greeks were very thankful when they had succeeded in sacking it once.

But the strongest and most striking evidence still remains to be adduced. This evidence will prove what the ancient Greeks desired and designed to indicate by the subjunctive, as well as what they did not. The Greek writers are many, but they have one mind on this subject. From first to last, from Homer to Herodian, there was one, and only one, opinion:—

Ἡ Θέμις ἐστὶ γυναικός, ἐπὴν πόσις ἄλλοθ' ὄληται.

—*Od.* xiv. 130.

According to the German theory, this line implies that the death of a woman's husband is an event of "indefinite frequency." According to revelation and universal experience, a man dies only once. "It is appointed unto men once to die." Of course, a theory which is contradicted by revelation, reason, and universal experience, cannot of necessity be correct. How such a theory could ever have been conceived in Germany, or received in this country, can only be

explained by the circumstance, that fact is far more wonderful than fable. Now that it has been seen what the subjunctive of the Greeks does not indicate, it is time to ascertain what it really does indicate. In the line last quoted from Homer, the subjunctive indicates the death of a human being. An event which happens once, and only once, in the life of a man, must assuredly be an *extraordinary* and *exceptional* event. Here is found the first trace of the subjunctive of the Latins. The idea was invented by the Greeks, and improved by the Latins. Illustrative instances are found in great abundance among the writers, down from Homer. The testimony of the father of tragedy completely coincides with the testimony of the father of Epic poetry:—

ἐπειδὰν αὐτοκτόνως
αὐτοδάϊκτοι θάνωσι.—Επ. Επ. Θηβ. 733.

Here the last solemn event is indicated by the subjunctive ἐπειδὰν θάνωσι.

The same event is indicated by the subjunctive in the Agamemnon:—

Ὅταν γυνὴ γυναικὸς ἀντ' ἐμοῦ θάνῃ.—1318.

Moreover, in the Eumenides:—

ἀνδρὸς δ' ἐπειδὰν αἷμ' ἀνασπάσῃ
ἄπαξ θανόντος.—647.

The coincidence between Homer and Æschylus extends also to the sack of a city,—an extraordinary event in its history:—

πολλὰ γὰρ εὖτε πτόλις δαμασθῇ
ἓ ἔ, δυστυχῆ τε πράσσει.—Επ. Επ. Θηβ. 338.

In a single play of Euripides there are two instances:—

ἀλλ' οὖν ἐκεῖσε προσδόκα μ', ὅταν θάνω.—*Alc.* 363.

Θανεῖ γε μέντοι δυσκλεής, ὅταν θάνῃς.—*Id.* 725.

In a single play of Sophocles there are two instances:—

Οὔ τοί ποθ' ὑχθρός, οὐδ' ὅταν θάνῃ φίλος.—*Ant.* 520.

ὅταν πέλας
ἤδη τὸν Ἅιδην εἰσορῶσι τοῦ βίου.—*Id.* 581.

In another play of Sophocles there are three instances:—

τῆς σῆς ὑπ' ὀργῆς, σοῖς ὅταν στῶσιν τάφοις.
—*Œd. Col.* 411.

ὅταν θάνω 'γώ, καὶ σύ μου ταφεὺς γένῃ.—*Id.* 582.

χὥταν εἰς τέλος
τοῦ ζῆν ἀφικνῇ.—*Id.* 1530.

In another play of Sophocles there are also two instances:—

ὅσον κακὸν
κείνῳ τε κἀμοὶ τοῦθ', ὅταν θάνῃς, νεμεῖς.—*Ajax*, 513.

μέχρις οὗ μυχοὺς κίχωσι τοῦ κάτω θεοῦ.—*Id.* 571.

There is also the coincidence in Sophocles with Homer and Æschylus as to the representation of the sacking of a city, or ravaging of a country, by ὅταν, and the subjunctive:—

τοῦτο δ' ἐννοεῖσθε, ὅταν
πορθῆτε γαῖαν, εὐσεβεῖν τὰ πρὸς θεούς.—*Phil.* 1440.

To the clear, consistent, copious testimony of these Greek authors, is to be added yet the testimony of Thucydides.

In the same chapter containing a description of the public funeral of those who had fallen in the first summer of the Peloponnesian war, there are found the two following passages:—

ἐπειδὰν δὲ ἡ ἐκφορὰ ᾖ, λάρναξ κυπαρισσίνας ἄγουσιν ἅμαξαι.

A few lines further down:—

ἐπειδὰν δὲ κρύψωσι γῆ, ἀνὴρ ἡγεμένος ὑπὸ τῆς πόλεως, λέγει ἐπ' αὐτοῖς ἔπαινον τὸν πρέποντα.—Lib. ii. 34.

Here the act of burial is twice spoken of, and in each case the act is indicated by the subjunctive—ἐπειδὰν ἡ ἐκφορὰ ᾖ, and ἐπειδὰν κρύψωσι γῆ.

It scarcely requires to be said that men are only once buried, and that their burial cannot be represented as an act of "indefinite frequency" any more than their death. It is the peculiarity of the act alone that the subjunctive has to do with, and nothing whatever either with "frequency" or "indefiniteness." In Greek, as in Latin, the subjunctive is found where every thing is most definite, while the indicative, on the other hand, is found where every thing is most indefinite. The Germans have failed to distinguish between an *accidental circumstance* and an *essential quality*. It is impossible that the *presence of* an *accidental* and *occasional* indefiniteness can be the cause of the subjunctive, for the entire *absence* of that does not prevent the occurrence of the subjunctive. Where the subjunctive is found, there also is found the *independent, inherent, essential* idea peculiar to it.

There will now be appended additional illustrative instances, in which there is a common affinity with those adduced above.

There is an obvious analogy between the completion of an arduous undertaking, or expedition, or journey, and the close of life. Homer, Hesiod, and Herodotus all agree in indicating this by the subjunctive:—

ἐπεὰν δὲ τοὺς ὄνους ἐλαύνοντες ἀπίκωνται ὀπίσω ἐς τοὺς Ἀρμενίους.—*Clio*, 194.

Here the conclusion of the expedition is indicated by the subjunctive—ἐπεὰν ἀπίκωνται. In the very same chapter there are found the following words:—

ἐπεὰν ὦν ἀπίκωνται πλέοντες ἐς τὴν Βαβυλῶνα.

It will be remembered that the first quotation in this treatise was—ἐπὰν εἰς Βαβυλῶνα ἥκωσι—so that the coincidence also between Herodotus and Xenophon is complete.

In Hesiod, the arrival at the summit of a steep ascent is indicated by the very same words:—

ἐπὴν δ' εἰς ἄκρον ἵκηται,
ῥηϊδίως δὴ ἔπειτα πέλει, χαλεπὴ περ ἐοῦσα.—[1]

Op. et Dies, 285.

And in the two following lines from Homer, the crowning act after a ten years' siege is indicated by the subjunctive:—

Ἀλλ' ἄγε μίμνετε πάντες ἐϋκνήμιδες Ἀχαιοί,
Αὐτοῦ, εἰσόκεν ἄστυ μέγα Πριάμοιο ἕλωμεν.—ii. 331.

How familiar to, and firmly fixed in, the mind of the Greeks, the idea in question was, may be illus-

trated by case after case in close succession in the Prometheus of Æschylus:—

πόντου περᾶσα φλοῖσβον, ἔς τ' ἂν ἐξίκῃ
πρὸς Γοργόνεια πεδία Κισθήνης.—792.

And:—

τούτου παρ' ὄχθας ἕρφ' ἕως ἂν ἐξίκῃ
καταβασμόν.—810, *Id.*

And:—

ὃν μὴ περάσῃς, οὐ γὰρ ἔυβατος περᾶν
πρὶν ἂν πρὸς αὐτὸν Καύκασον μόλῃς.—720, *Id.*

In all these cases the subjunctive indicates the completion of a stage in the wanderings of Io. In the following, the termination of the sufferings of Prometheus himself is indicated by the same mood:—

ἐγὼ δὲ τὴν παροῦσαν ἀντλήσω τύχην
ἕς τ' ἂν Διὸς φρόνημα λωφήσῃ χόλου.—371, *Id.*

And:—

νῦν δ' οὐδέν ἐστι τέρμα μοι προκείμενον
μόχθων, πρὶν ἂν Ζεὺς ἐκπέσῃ τυραννίδος.—756, *Id.*

And:—

πρὶν ἂν χαλασθῇ δεσμὰ λυμαντήρια.—991, *Id.*

And:—

τοιοῦδε μόχθου τέρμα μὴ τὶ προσδόκα
πρὶν ἂν θεῶν τις διάδοχος τῶν σῶν πόνων
φανῇ.—1025, *Id.*

The practice of Pindar, who was a contemporary of Æschylus, coincided precisely with his on this point:—

Καὶ ὅταν καλὰ ἔρξαις ἀοιδᾶς ἄτερ,
Ἀγησίδαμ' εἰς Ἀΐδα σταθμὸν
ἀνὴρ ἵκηται, κενεὰ πνεύσαις ἔπορε μόχθῳ βραχύ τι τερπόν.
—*Olymp.* xi. 95.

Here the descent to Hades is indicated by the subjunctive. Of course, the idea that that act was one of "indefinite frequency" is a sheer impossibility. From that bourne no traveller ever returned—Vestigia nulla retrorsum.

In the next passage from Pindar, the arrival of Jason at the court of Pelias is indicated by the subjunctive. The arrival of a stranger to claim the throne is not an every-day event in the life of a monarch, and may fairly be regarded as extraordinary or exceptional:—

τὸν μονοκρήπιδα παντῶς ἐν φυλακᾷ σχεθέμεν μεγάλᾳ,
εὖτ' ἂν αἰπεινῶν ἀπὸ σταθμῶν ἐς εὐδείελον
χθόνα μόλῃ κλειτᾶς Ἰωλκοῦ.—Pyth. iv. 77.

There is a very remarkable passage in the *Memorabilia* of Xenophon, which presents at once the *accidental* circumstance of "indefiniteness" and "frequency" which has misled the Germans, and the *essential* property of the subjunctive:—

"Τί δ'; οἴει ἔφη," "χαλεπώτερον εἶναί σοι ἀκούειν ὧν αὐτὴ λέγει, ἢ τοῖς ὑποκριταῖς, ὅταν ἐν ταῖς τραγῳδίαις ἀλλήλους τὰ ἔσχατα λέγωσιν.—Lib. II., ii. 9.

It is quite true that the mutual abuse of actors was an act of "frequency," and the specification of time is quite "indefinite;" but that these circumstances are merely *accidental* is proved by the almost endless examples given where the subjunctive was found indicating a *single specific* act. The *essential* property peculiar to the subjunctive, everywhere independent of either "frequency or indefiniteness," is

here expressly indicated by the very word ἔσχατα itself = *extreme.* The very same word is found with the same mood, the subjunctive, in Sophocles:—

λέγων ὅσ' ἂν
Θέλῃς καθ' ἡμῶν ἔσχατ' ἐσχάτων κακά.—*Phil.* 65.

This *extreme* is seen sometimes in the shape of what is greatly to be *desired*, or greatly to be *dreaded.*

Let old Homer, who is as orthodox as he is old, be first cited into court:—

οὐ μὲν γὰρ τοῦ γε κρεῖσσον καὶ ἄρειον
Ἢ ὅθ' ὁμοφρονέοντε νοήμασιν οἶκον ἔχητον
Ἀνὴρ ἠδὲ γυνή.—*Od.* vi. 183.

The same sentiment is found with the same syntax in the poet Phocylides:—

τί γὰρ ἡδύτερον καὶ ἄρειον
Ἢ ὅταν ἀνδρὶ γυνὴ φρονέῃ φίλα γήραος ἄχρι.—Νουθ., ver. 184.

The same sentiment, and its converse, with the same syntax, are found in the same play in Euripides:—

Ἥπερ μεγίστη γίγνεται σωτηρία
ὅταν γυνὴ πρὸς ἄνδρα μὴ διχοστατῇ.—*Med.* 15.
ὅταν δ' ἐς εὐνὴν ἠδικημένη κυρῇ
οὐκ ἔστιν ἄλλη φρὴν μιαιφονωτέρα.—*Id.* 265.

The two extremes of good and evil fortune are expressed by the subjunctive in consecutive lines by Æschylus:—

φίλοι, κακῶν μὲν ὅστις ἔμπειρος κυρεῖ,
ἐπίσταται βροτοῖσιν ὡς ὅταν κλύδων
κακῶν ἐπέλθῃ, πάντα δειμαίνειν φιλεῖ,
ὅταν δ' ὁ δαίμων εὐροῇ, πεποιθέναι,
τὸν αὐτὸν ἀεὶ δαίμον' οὐριεῖν τύχης.—*Per.* 602.

The extreme of evil is very clearly indicated by the subjunctive in the following illustrative instances:—

τί που
δρᾶσεις, ὅταν τὰ λοιπὰ πυνθάνῃ κακά.—*Prom.* 744.
ὅταν δ' ἀπευκτὰ πήματ' ἄγγελος πόλει
στυγνῷ προσώπῳ πτωσίμου στρατοῦ φέρῃ,
πόλει μὲν ἕλκος ἓν τὸ δήμιον τυχεῖν.—*Ag.* 639.

The ruin of the intellect by indulgence in wine will generally be regarded as an evil, and an extraordinary and exceptional one, moreover, expressed by the subjunctive:—

Ὅταν ὁ νοῦς ὑπὸ οἴνου διαφθαρῇ, ταὐτὰ πάσχει τοῖς ἅρμασι τοὺς ἡνιόχους ἀποβαλοῦσι.—*Isoc. ad Dem.* 9.

Whatever causes the earth to lie untilled, must be classified in the same category as the preceding instance. Xenophon likewise employs the same mood as Isocrates for its expression:—

ὅπου δ' ἂν ἀναγκασθῇ ἡ γῆ χερσεύειν, ἀποσβέννυνται καὶ αἱ ἄλλαι τέχναι σχεδόν τι καὶ κατὰ γῆν καὶ κατὰ θάλασσαν.—*Œcon.* v. 17.

To be beset by a wild boar, with only one hope of escape, will also probably be regarded as an evil equally extrordinary and exceptional. Xenophon likewise employs the subjunctive for the expression of this position:—

Ἀπαλλαγὴ δὲ τούτων μία ἐστι μόνη, ὅταν ἐν τῇ ἀνάγκῃ ταύτῃ ἔχηται.—*Ven.* x. 1.

A slanderous report will commonly be considered an evil, and, in most communities, it is hoped, an

extraordinary and exceptional one. The testimony of Sophocles on this point coincides completely with his countrymen:—

σὲ δ' ὅταν πληγὴ Διὸς ἢ ζαμενὴς
λόγος ἐκ Δαναῶν κακόθρους ἐπιβῇ,
μέγαν ὄκνον ἔχω καὶ πεφόβημαι.—*Ajax*, 137.

Whatever constrains one to pray for death as a means of escape, must surely be considered an extraordinary or exceptional evil:—

ὅταν κατεύχῃ ταῦθ', ὁμοῦ κἀμοὶ θανεῖν
εὔχου.—*Id.* 392.

The intelligence of a son's insanity conveyed to his mother is next indicated by the subjunctive:—

μάτηρ ὅταν νιν νοσοῦντα
φρενομόρως ἀκούσῃ.—*Id.* 626.

The intelligence of Ajax's death is indicated by the same mood a few lines farther down:—

ἦ που ταλάινα, τήνδ' ὅταν κλύῃ φάτιν,
ἥσει μέγαν κωκυτὸν ἐν πάσῃ πόλει.—850.

Sophocles employs the subjunctive, when Œdipus makes the discovery of his marriage with his mother:—

ποῖος Κιθαιρὼν οὐχὶ σύμφωνος τάχα
ὅταν καταίσθῃ τὸν ὑμέναιον.—*Œd. Tyr.* 422.

A subject proceeding to plot against his sovereign is indicated by the subjunctive in the next illustrative instance:—

ὅταν ταχύς τις ὑπιβουλεύων λάθρα
χωρῇ.—*Id.* 618.

Excess in anger, an evil both to one's self and

others, and it is to be hoped an exceptional evil, is indicated by the same mood:—

βαρὺς δ' ὅταν
θυμοῦ περάσῃς.—*Id.* 673.

A bird bereft of its brood is indicated by the same mood:—

ὡς ὅταν κενῆς
εὐνῆς νεοσσῶν ὀρφανὸν βλέψῃ λέχος.—*Ant.* 425.

The utter absence of power to enjoy life is expressed by the same means:—

τὰς γὰρ ἡδονὰς
ὅταν προδῶσιν ἄνδρες, οὐ τίθημ' ἐγὼ
ζῆν τοῦτον.—*Id.* 1167.

The subjunctive in the following quotation expresses an act of mental aberration:—

ὅταν
τὰ θεῖ' ἀφείς τίς εἰς τὸ μαίνεσθαι τραπῇ.
—*Œd. Col.* 1537.

The following additional examples from the Philoctetes, all containing the common characteristic of something or other evil, do not require separate comment:—

οὐκ ἔστι λησταῖς πνεῦμ' ἐναντιούμενον,
ὅταν παρῇ κλέψαι τε χἁρπάσαι βίᾳ.—644.
λαμβάνει γὰρ οὖν
ὕπνος μ', ὅταν περ τὸ κακὸν ἐξήκῃ τόδε.—767.
ἅπαντα δυσχέρεια, τὴν αὑτοῦ φύσιν
ὅταν λιπών τις δρᾷ τὰ μὴ προσεικότα.—903.
ὦ Ζεῦ, τί δράσω; δεύτερον ληφθῶ κακός,
κρύπτων θ' ἃ μὴ δεῖ, καὶ λέγων αἰσχιστ' ἐπῶν.—909.

In the *Philoctetes* alone almost as many illustrative instances have been left as have been given, from a fear lest the reader's patience be exhausted sooner than the long list. The plays of Sophocles, who, besides being the prince of tragic poets, was also remarkable as a correct thinker and a clear writer, abound in such illustrations. There is another Greek writer who resembles him in this respect, Plato, the prince of Grecian philosophers. The first passage to be cited is contained in his well-known work, the *Republic*, where he plays the part of the critic himself on a passage from the poet Æschylus. His citation from this dramatist proves, in a manner not to be mistaken, that his conception of the subjunctive did not coincide with that of the Germans. He says—*οὐδὲ Αἰσχύλου, ὅταν φῇ ἡ Θέτις τὸν Ἀπόλλω ἐν τοῖς αὑτῆς γάμοις ᾄδοντα.*

It is as utterly impossible to say that *ὅταν* with the subjunctive here indicates "indefinite frequency" as it is to say that "men die oftener than once," for Plato specifies the time and place and attendant circumstances :—

κἀγὼ τὸ Φοίβου θεῖον ἀψευδὲς στόμα
ἡλπιζον εἶναι, μαντικῇ βρύον τέχνῃ.
ὁ δ', αὐτὸς ὑμνῶν, αὐτὸς ἐν θοίνῃ παρών,
αὐτὸς τάδ' εἰπών, αὐτός ἐστιν ὁ κτανὼν
τὸν παῖδα τὸν ἐμόν.—*Rep.* lib. ii. 21.

Plato here censures Æschylus for censuring the gods,—an act equally evil and extraordinary. He has coupled Homer with him,—*Ὁμήρου τοῦτο οὐκ ἐπαινεσόμεθα, οὐδὲ Αἰσχύλου, ὅταν φῇ.*

This act is indicated by the subjunctive.

In this same book, Plato again censures Æschylus for censuring the gods:—

οὐδ' αὖ, ὡς Αἰσχύλος λέγει; ἐατέον ἀκούειν τοὺς νέους, ὅτι :—

Θεὸς μὲν αἰτίαν φύει βροτοῖς,
ὅταν κακῶσαι δῶμα παμπήδην θέλῃ.—380, A.

Though Plato and Æschylus differ in sentiment, they agree in syntax. Plato in censuring Æschylus, and Æschylus in censuring the gods, equally employ the subjunctive for that purpose.

Further, in this very book the following words are found:—

ὅπερ χρὴ καὶ πρῶτον καὶ μάλιστα μέμφεσθαι.

Here censure is expressed regarding something with all the emphasis of which words are capable. Then to the question, what is this—τί τοῦτο; the answer is given:—

ὅταν εἰκάζῃ τις κακῶς τῷ λόγῳ περὶ Θεῶν.

Id. 377, E.

The subjunctive is again used to indicate the same idea as in the preceding instances.

Plato, by a quotation from Homer, supplements the argument:—

λοιβῇ τε κνίσῃ παρατρωπῶσ' ἄνθρωποι
λισσόμενοι, ὅτε κέν τις ὑπερβήῃ καὶ ἁμάρτῃ.

Id. 364, E.

The subjunctive ὑπερβήῃ singly expresses the combined idea of evil in excess.

One other contribution to the argument may be levied on the second book of the *Republic* for the sake

of the striking coincidence it furnishes to a passage already quoted from the Antigone:—

"Οταν διὰ μανίαν ἤ τινα ἄνοιαν κακόν τι ἐπιχειρῶσι πράττειν.
—*Rep.* ii. 21.

ὅταν
τὰ δεῖ' ἀφείς τις εἰς τὸ μαίνεσθαι τραπῇ.
—*Œd. Col.* 1537.

Philosopher and poet alike employ the subjunctive to express the extraordinary visitation of madness. The fifth book of the *Republic* furnishes a more striking and significant coincidence still. It will be remembered that, in opposition to the German theory, "the subjunctive may be considered to express an indefinite frequency," Homer and Æschylus, Euripides and Sophocles, Xenophon and Thucydides were called into court. The evidence of the ancient Greeks in favour of their native tongue was uniformly adverse to the foreign theory of the modern Germans. These great writers agreed to express an event which can only occur once in the lives of men —death—by the subjunctive:—

Ἡ δέμις ἐστὶ γυναικός, ἐπὴν πόσις ἄλλοθ' ὅληται.
—*Homer.*

"Οταν γυνὴ γυναικὸς ἀντ' ἐμοῦ θάνῃ.—*Æschylus.*

Ἀλλ' οὖν ἐκεῖσε προσδόκα μ' ὅταν θάνω.—*Euripides.*

"Οταν θάνω 'γὼ καὶ σύ μου ταφεὺς γένῃ.—*Sophocles.*

Ἐπέταξεν αὐτῇ, ἐπειδὰν ἀποθάνῃ, περικαλύψαι αὐτήν.
—*Xenophon.*

Ἐπειδὰν δὲ κρύψωσι γῇ, ἀνὴρ ἐπ' αὐτοῖς λέγει ὧδε.
—*Thucydides.*

To the testimony of these is to be added the testimony of Plato,—

Ταὐτὰ δὲ ταῦτα νομιοῦμεν, ὅταν τις γήρᾳ ἢ τινι ἄλλῳ τρόπῳ τελευτήσῃ.—*Rep.* lib. v. 15.

So common was the practice of the Greeks on this point that, according to the best of all evidence,—their own writings,—it was adopted as a matter of course. In the same chapter Plato writes:—

ὥς τι τῶν δεόντων, δρῶντας, ὅταν περὶ τὸν τεθνεῶτα κυπτάζωσι.

One other illustrative instance (itself equal to a thousand others) of the subjunctive indicating a single specific act—the death of Socrates by poison, an event equally extraordinary and evil—must be cited from the great master of the Academy, taken from the immortal trilogy, where the first martyr to intellectual truth, with meek yet majestic composure, took the cup from the hand of his weeping executioner:—

Καὶ ἦκεν ὁ τῶν ἕνδεκα ὑπηρέτης καὶ στὰς παρ' αὐτὸν, ὦ Σώκρατες, ἔφη, οὐ καταγνώσομαί γε σοῦ ὅπερ τῶν ἄλλων καταγιγνώσκω, ὅτι μοι χαλεπαίνουσι καὶ καταρῶνται, ἐπειδὰν αὐτοῖς παραγγέλλω πίνειν τὸ φάρμακον ἀναγκαζόντων τῶν ἀρχόντων. —*Phædo*, 65, C.

It will be remembered that Æschylus and Euripides have already furnished examples in juxtaposition of the subjunctive, indicating something extraordinary, a deviation from a common mean, either in the direction of something excessively good or excessively bad, something greatly to be desired or greatly to be

dreaded. Plato, with his usual fertility, furnishes illustrative specimens equally certain and conspicuous in close contiguity :—

Ἦ δοκεῖ σοι, τούτου αἴσχιον εἶναι τοῦτο, ὅταν τις μὴ μόνον τὸ πολὺ τοῦ βίου ἐν δικαστηρίοις φεύγων τε καὶ διώκων κατατρίβηται ;—*Rep.* iii. 405, B.

A question here is put intimating in a manner not to be mistaken, that nothing can be more base than what follows, which is expressed by the subjunctive.

Within a few lines the following sentence is found: Ἀκολασίας δὲ καὶ νόσων πληθυουσῶν ἐν πόλει ἆρ' οὐ δικαστήριά τε καὶ ἰατρεῖα πολλὰ ἀνοίγεται, καὶ δικανική τε καὶ ἰατρικὴ σεμνύνονται, ὅταν δὴ καὶ ἐλεύθεροι πολλοὶ καὶ σφόδρα περὶ αὐτὰ σπουδάζωσιν ;—*Id.* 405, A.

The word σφόδρα itself, with ὅταν σπουδάζωσιν, expresses the excessive zeal with which gentlemen devote themselves to the art of healing and the practice of law, in a state abounding in lawlessness and afflicted with disease.

In a passage from Xenophon, cited above, the state of land lying waste, a condition greatly to be dreaded and deplored, is described by the subjunctive—ὅπουδ' ἂν ἀναγκασθῇ ἡ γῆ χερσεύειν. The opposite extreme of fertility, one greatly to be desired, is described by Herodotus with the subjunctive—ἐπεὰν δὲ ἄριστα αὐτὴ ἑωυτῆς ἐνείκῃ, ἐπὶ τριηκόσια ἐκφέρει.—*Clio*, i. 193.

Absence of water is also an extreme greatly to be dreaded and deprecated. Abundance of water, its opposite, is another greatly to be desired. Herodotus

elsewhere, in one passage, expresses both extremes by the employment of the subjunctive,—

ἐπεὰν ὦν μηδέν σφι παραδίδωται τοῦ ὕδατος, ἐλθόντες ἐς τοὺς Πέρσας αὐτοί τε καὶ γυναῖκες, στάντες κατὰ τὰς θύρας τοῦ βασιλέως, βοῶσι ὠρυόμενοι.—*Thalia*, iii. 117.

ἐπεὰν μηδὲν παραδίδωται expresses the first extreme. A few lines farther down, the second extreme is found expressed by means of the same mood:—

ἐπεὰν δὲ διάκορος ἡ γῆ σφέων γένηται πίνουσα τὸ ὕδωρ, αὖται μὲν αἱ πύλαι ἀποκληίονται.

A violent wind or wave, which, bringing destruction to mariners, is greatly dreaded by them, and a gentle breeze, which, bearing them to their haven, is greatly desired by them, are, with equal propriety, expressed by the subjunctive:—

Ἐν δ' ἔπεσ' ὡς ὅτε κῦμα θοὴ ἐν νηῒ πέσῃσι
Λάῤῥον ὑπαὶ νεφέων, τρομέουσι δέ τε φρένα ναῦται.
—*Il.* xv. 624.

That is an instance of the violent gale: the following is an instance of the favourable breeze:—

Καὶ λέγετε, ὅταν ὁ Βορεᾶς πνέῃ, ὡς καλοὶ πλοῖ εἰσιν εἰς τὴν Ἑλλάδα.—*Anab.* v. 7, 7.

Xenophon, in the same book, furnishes an instance of the violent gale; and Homer, in the twenty-first book, an instance of the breeze favourable to farmers:

Ὅταν δὲ χειμὼν ᾖ καὶ θάλαττα μεγάλη ἐπιφέρηται, οὐχ ὁρᾶτε ὅτι καὶ πνεύματος μόνου ἕνεκα χαλεπαίνει κυβερνήτης τοῖς ἐν πρύμνῃ;—8, 20.

Ὡς δ' ὅτ' ὀπωρινὸς Βορέης νεοαρδέ' ἀλωὴν
Αἶψ' ἀνξηραίνῃ, χαίρει δέ μιν ὅστις ἐθείρει.—347.

Sophocles also furnishes striking instances of the two opposite cases:—

Ὅμοιον ὥστε ποντίαις
οἵδμα δυσπνοόις ὅταν
Θρήσσησιν ἔρεβος ὕφαλον ἐπιδράμῃ πνοαῖς.
—*Ant.* 588.

οὐκοῦν ἐπειδὰν πνεῦμα τοὐκ πρώρας ἀνῇ
τότε στελοῦμεν. νῦν γὰρ ἀντιστατεῖ.—*Phil.* 640.

In the very next line of the same play, that fortunate conjuncture of circumstances which enables one to escape from a metaphorical sea of evils, is with equal propriety expressed by the subjunctive:—

ἀεὶ καλὸς πλοῦς ἔσθ', ὅταν φεύγῃς κακά.

To the first of the two quotations from Homer, given above, some others of a similar character may be added, which, containing similes introduced by the subjunctive, present a very striking and significant contrast to those introduced by the indicative:—

Μαίνετο δ' ὡς ὅτ' Ἄρης ἐγχέσπαλος ἢ ὀλοὸν πῦρ
Οὔρεσι μαίνηται, βαθέης ἐνὶ τάρφεσιν ὕλης.—*Il.* xv. 606.

Here Homer represents the mad fury of devouring fire by means of the subjunctive, just as Sophocles and Plato, as already quoted, have represented the madness of men by the same mood:—

ὅταν
τὰ θεῖ' ἀφείς τις εἰς τὸ μαίνεσθαι τραπῇ.—*Soph.*
ὅταν διὰ μανίαν κακόν τι ἐπιχειρῶσι πράττειν.—*Plato.*

Such a coincidence can only be accounted for by the fact that these countrymen had one common opinion as to the function of the subjunctive.

The next two illustrative instances represent Jove thundering, and in both cases this extraordinary phenomenon is expressed by the subjunctive:—

Ἀλλὰ καὶ ὃς δείδοικε Διὸς μεγάλοιο κεραυνόν,
Δεινήν τε βροντήν, ὅτ' ἀπ' οὐρανόθεν σμαραγήσῃ.
—xxi. 199.

Ὡς δ' ὅτ' ἂν ἀστράπτῃ πόσις Ἥρης ἠϋκόμοιο.
—*Il.* x. 5.

The same mood represents the earth struck with lightning by Jove in his anger:—

Γαῖα δ' ὑπεστονάχιζε, Διΐ ὣς τερπικεραύνῳ
Χωομένῳ, ὅτε τ' ἀμφὶ Τυφωέϊ γαῖαν ἰμάσσῃ.
—ii. 782.

On the other hand, the indicative is contrasted with the subjunctive by representing a mother removing a fly from the cheek of her boy:—

ὡς ὅτε μήτηρ
Παιδὸς ἐέργει μυῖαν.—iv. 131.

Perhaps it could scarcely be possible to present two more certain and conspicuous cases of the subjunctive, indicating an extreme of evil and of good, than the two following, one from Aristotle, one from Thucydides:—

ἔτι ὅταν παρὰ τὸν νόμον βλάπτῃ.—*Eth. Eud.*, iv. 15.

καὶ δι' αὐτὴν οἶδ' ὅτι μέρος τι μᾶλλον ἔτι μισοῦμαι, οὐ δικαίως, εἰ μὴ καὶ ὅταν παρὰ λόγον τι εὖ πράξητε ἐμοὶ ἀναθήσετε.—Lib. ii. 64.

Here, in either case, the very word παρά, "contrary to," is expressed along with the subjunctive. In the one case an evil act "contrary to law" is indicated

in words, and not left to be implied by the subjunctive; in the other, a good event "exceeding expectation" is indicated in the same manner. The fact that the Greeks employed ὅταν and ἐπειδάν exclusively with the subjunctive furnishes positive proof that they associated only one idea with that mood.

Since more instances of the subjunctive introducing an extreme under the form of something evil or unfortunate, than an extreme under the form of something good or fortunate, a few more additional examples of the latter may be appended. Here, no other Greek does better service than the poet Pindar; and with whatever justice the charge of obscurity may be brought against him elsewhere, there is assuredly no ground for it in the following passages:—

ἐσλῶν γὰρ ὑπὸ χαρμάτων πῆμα θνάσκει
παλίγκοτον δαμασθέν,
ὅταν θεοῦ Μοῖρα πέμπῃ
ἀνεκὰς ὄλβον ὑψηλόν.—*Ol.* ii. 24.

ὁ πλοῦτος εὐρυσθενής,
ὅταν τις ἀρετᾷ κεκραμένον καθαρᾷ
βροτήσιος ἀνὴρ πότμον παραδόντος αὐτὸν ἀνάγῃ
πολύφιλον ἐπέταν.—*Pyth.* v. 2.

ὄλβος οὐκ ἐς μακρὸν ἀνδρῶν ἔρχεται
ὅυ, πολὺς εὖτ' ἂν ἐπιβρίσας ἔπηται.—*Id.* iii. 106.

ἀλλ' ὅταν αἴγλα διόσδοτος ἔλθῃ,
λαμπρὸν φέγγος ἔπεστιν ἀνδρῶν
καὶ μείλιχος αἰών.—*Id.* viii. 100.

In all these cases, crowding on each other in close succession, the very words expressive of excessive prosperity, *ὄλβον ὑψηλόν, πλοῦτος εὐρυσθενής, ὄλβος πολύς, αἴγλα διόσδοτος*, are introduced by *ὅταν* with the subjunctive.

In the next line, the same peculiar prosperity coming from the same source is indicated by the same word :—

Ὅταν δ' ὁ δαίμων εὖ διδῷ τί δεῖ φίλων;—Eurip., *Or.* 658.

In the following passage from Plato, not only the sentiment and syntax are the same, but the similarity extends even to the very words :—

Πάντα σχεδὸν ἀπείργασται τῷ θεῷ, ὅταν βουληθῇ διαφερόντως εὖ πρᾶξαί τινα πόλιν.—Legg., p. 170, D.

Such a coincidence without any collusion is the best and strongest proof that the Greeks had one and the same opinion relative to the subjunctive. This same opinion was shared by all the more profound teachers of the Church. Thus, Gregory of Nyssa has written :—

Ἀγαθὸν κτῆνός ἐστιν ὁ θυμός, ὅταν τοῦ λογισμοῦ ὑποζύγιον γένηται.

Aristophanes and Euripides coincide in expressing the extreme, but not enduring felicity that is enjoyed under the influence of wine :—

Ὁρᾷς; ὅταν πίνωσιν ἄνθρωποι τότε
εὐδαιμονοῦσιν.—Equit. 92.

The corroborative complement of this is contained in the beautiful play of the *Bacchae* :—

βότρυος ὑγρὸν πῶμ' ηὗρε κεἰσηνέγκατο
θνητοῖς, ὃ πάυει τοὺς ταλαιπώρους βροτοὺς
λύπης, ὅταν πλησθῶσιν ἀμπέλου ῥοῆς.—281.

Euripides also, in another play, presents in one line the extreme of evil, in the very next line the extreme of good:—

δεινὸν οἱ πολλοί, κακούργους ὅταν ἔχωσι προστάτας.
ἀλλ' ὅταν χρηστοὺς λάβωσι, χρηστὰ βουλεύουσ' ἀεί.
—*Or.* 771.

A case of coincidence between Euripides and Aristophanes has been given above. The coincidence, confined to the syntax of the subjunctive, comes out with peculiar force where there is no sympathy between the general sentiments of the two. Aristophanes, by his wicked wit often raised the reverberating roar of laughter against Euripides in the theatre at Athens, but amidst all his misrepresentations he never made him misrepresent the subjunctive. Though nothing could be more improper than to impute improper practices to him, nothing could be more proper than to make this imputation by means of the subjunctive:—

ὅταν τὰ νῦν ἄπιστα πίστ' ἡγώμεθα,
τὰ δ' ὄντα πίστ' ἄπιστα.—*Frogs*, 1443.

Thus, from the fact that ὅταν and ἐπειδάν invariably accompany the subjunctive, and uniformly or almost uniformly introduce the same idea, it follows that an essential property belongs to that mood. The occasional and accidental adjunct of "indefinite frequency" the Germans have mistaken for an essential property. It is clearly impossible that the presence of the "indefinite" element can account for the occurrence of the subjunctive, for its absence does not

prevent the occurrence of that mood. The subjunctive is constantly found without an indefinite. The indicative is constantly found with an indefinite. Therefore it follows that *indefinites* have nothing whatever to do with the determination of moods.

It has been seen from almost endless examples given above, that if the German theory be true, then it follows that men die oftener than once, that contracts are performed oftener than once, and that an event can happen for the first time oftener than once. The ancient Greeks, so far from confirming this theory of the modern Germans, employ the subjunctive to make the most precise specifications of time and place of which language is capable. Hesiod says:—

εὖτ' ἂν πρῶτα φανῇ σθένος Ὠρίωνος.—598, Εργα.

Herodotus says:—

ἀλλ' ἐπεὰν τριταῖαι ἢ τεταρταῖαι γένωνται.—ii. 89.

But this is not all. Not only does this theory contradict the dictates of reason and universal experience, but it makes sad havoc of history. All history concurs in representing the "Ten Thousand" as crossing the Hellespont *once* when homeward bound, but the German theory represents this single act as one of "indefinite frequency":—

ἐπειδὰν δὲ διαβῇ, ἐγὼ μὲν ἀπαλλάξομαι.—*An.* vii. 16.

One other sentence only remains to be cited at this stage of the argument. Had this sentence been read, or, being read, had been remembered, the theory under review could never have been either conceived by one or believed by others. An act is "frequently"

repeated, but assuredly not "indefinitely," for the number of times is specified:—

ἐπειδὰν δὲ σημήνῃ τῷ κέρατι ὡς ἀναπάυεσθαι, συσκευάζεσθε· ἐπειδὰν δὲ τὸ δεύτερον, ἀνατίθεσθε ἐπὶ τὰ ὑποζύγια· ἐπὶ δὲ τῷ τρίτῳ ἕπεσθε.—ii. 2, 4.

After this, let men say all conceivable and inconceivable absurdities, that rivers run up from the sea to the hills, that fire freezes, and snow burns; but, at least, don't let them say that the subjunctive is the mood of "indefinite frequency."

II. THE RELATIVE WITH THE SUBJUNCTIVE.

The case now to be considered completely coincides with the case considered above, and therefore confirms it. The subjunctive, introducing a person or class of persons, has as much to do with the idea of "indefiniteness" as the subjunctive introducing a description of time or place, *i.e.*, nothing at all. The proof produced by the Greek writers, the best of all witnesses, is perfect, that the subjunctive is entirely independent of "indefinites." *The subjunctive is constantly found without "indefinites," while the indicative is constantly found with "indefinites."* In this respect, moreover, the Greek and Latin languages completely coincide:—

ἥτις ποτ' εἶ σύ.—*Alces.* 1062.

Quicquid id est.—*Æn.* ii.

When we turn to the subjunctive, with the relative

or article for the relative, the reference is most *definite* and distinct:—

τοῖσι (*i.e.*, τῷ Σκυθικῷ γένει) γὰρ μήτε ἄστεα μήτε τείχεα ἢ ἐκτισμένα, κῶς οὐκ ἂν εἴησαν οὗτοι ἀμαχόι.—*Her.* iv. 46.

The reference here is to the Scythian race. The extraordinary and exceptional condition of men without cities and walls is indicated by the subjunctive, ᾖ. The Romans would have indicated the same fact by the same mood—*Sunt qui neque urbes neque muros aedificent.*

The presence of the particle ἄν or κε, which is very often found in this combination, cannot be the cause of the subjunctive, because its absence does not prevent the occurrence of the occurrence of the subjunctive. It is merely an accidental adjunct, not an essential property of the mood:—

τί γὰρ γυναικὸς ἥτις ἄνδρα νοσφίσῃ;—*Eumen.* 211.

Here the essential property of the subjunctive is seen at once. It is surely an extraordinary and exceptional act,—a woman killing her husband. The accidental adjunct ἄν is conspicuous by its absence. The same writer employs the same mood to describe the fate of those persons whose native city has been sacked:—

μοχθηρόν, ὥσπερ ἄνδρας ὧν ἁλῷ πόλις.—*Theb.* 257.

A line in the same play has been already quoted, indicating the time of such a calamity, and, of course, by the same mood:—

πολλὰ γὰρ εὖτε πτόλις δαμασθῇ,
ἔᾳ, δυστυχῇ τε πράσσει.—*Id.* 340.

And just as instance after instance has been given above of ὅταν, introducing the time of death,—an extraordinary event in the life of men,—so ὅστις, with the subjunctive, introduces the person doomed to die:—

ἱερὸς γὰρ οὗτος τῶν κατὰ χθονὸς θεῶν
ὅτου τόδ' ἔγχος κρατὸς ἁγνίσῃ τρίχα.—*Alces.* 76.

Euripides also, in the *Ion*, describes a slave not inferior to freedmen by means of the same mood:—

τῶν ἐλευθέρων
οὐδεὶς κακίων δοῦλος ὅστις ἐσθλὸς ᾖ.—856.

So, in Sophocles, one is described who has fallen when young:—

γέροντα δ' ὀρθοῦν φλαῦρον, ὅς νέος πέσῃ.—*Col.* 395.

The extreme in the shape of what is evil or good, is as certain in this combination as in the one already considered:—

ὦ Ζεῦ, τί δὴ χρυσοῦ μὲν ὅς κίβδηλος ἦ
τεκμήρι' ἀνθρώποισιν ὥπασας σαφῆ.—*Med.* 516.

Counterfeit coin is a thing equally evil and exceptional: a deviation certainly from a correct standard, consequently it is expressed by the subjunctive.

The other extreme, in the shape of what is good or excellent, is expressed with equal clearness by the same poet in another play:—

ὡς ἀνὴρ ὅστις τρόποισι συντακῇ θυραῖος ὢν
μυρίων κρείσσων ὁμαίμων ἀνδρὶ κεκτῆσθαι φίλος.
—*Or.* 805.

The idea in question is no new-fangled one, but as old as Homer himself, and therefore as ortho-

dox as it is old. Homer, in one and the same sentence, gives an illustrative instance of the first combination described in this treatise, and, moreover, another of the present combination, a description of time and a description of character, but both described by the subjunctive :—

Ζεύς, ὅτε δή ῥ ἄνδρεσσι κοτεσσάμενος χαλεπήνῃ,
Οἵ βίῃ εἰν ἀγορῇ σκολιὰς κρίνωσι θέμιστας
Ἐκ δὲ δίκην ἐλάσωσι, θεῶν ὅπιν οὐκ ἀλέγοντες.
—*Il.* xvi. 386.

It must have been an exceptional and extraordinary occasion when Jove's dignity was disturbed by anger. Nor were they less exceptional and extraordinary characters, who, unlike Minos and Rhadamanthus, delivered unrighteous judgments in defiance of all law human and divine.

Æschylus (*Ag.* 1081) represents the name of the god Apollo as derived from ἀπόλλυμι, *i.e.*, the destroyer of evil-doers. Euripides represents the god himself as swerving from the path of rectitude. Surely this would be an extraordinary and exceptional act. But, of course, the ordinary mode of representing these extraordinary acts is the subjunctive mood :—

ὅ που δ' Ἀπόλλων σκαιὸς ᾖ, τίνες σοφοί ;
—*Electra*, 972.

But the essential idea inherent in the subjunctive is not left to be inferred indirectly, for it is very often expressed by the *superlative* itself in connexion with the subjunctive :—

τὴν γὰρ ἀοιδὴν μᾶλλον ἐπικλείουσ' ἄνθρωποι,
ἥτις ἀκουόντεσσι νεωτάτη ἀμφιπέληται.—*Od.* i. 351.

Hesiod here coincides with Homer :—

οὗτος μὲν πανάριστος, ὃς αὐτῷ πάντα νοήσῃ.—Ἐρ. 291.

Here, too, the confirmation of this doctrine is made manifest by the coincidence of the Latin language :—Earum etiam rerum auctoritatem, si quæ *illustriores videantur* amittere, etc.—Cic. *Academ.* ii. 41, 128. *Illustriores* implies what is more distinguished than usual, and hence is followed by the subjunctive.

Since in the preceding illustrative instances the subjunctive is found without ἄν, it is quite clear that in those that follow, this particle is a mere accidental adjunct, and has nothing whatever to do with the mood. Towards the commencement of this treatise, a passage was cited from the *Memorabilia* of Xenophon, which could not have been more conclusive and decisive had the biographer of Socrates been writing with the desire and design of proving what the subjunctive was :—

ὅταν ἐν ταῖς τραγῳδίαις ἀλλήλους τὰ ἔσχατα λέγωσιν.

The coincidence in the two additional passages carries its own conclusion—the one from the prince of Attic philosophers, the other from the prince of Attic poets :—

Οἳ δ' ἂν τὰ ἔσχατα ἀδικήσωσι καὶ διὰ τὰ τοιαῦτα ἀδικήματα ἀνίατοι γένωνται.—*Gorgias*, 525, C.

λέγων ὅσ' ἂν
θέλῃς καθ' ἡμῶν ἔσχατ' ἐσχάτων κακά.—*Phil.* 65.

Here, in those three writers, there are three coincidences,—same mood, same word, same degree of comparison. The very word itself, ἔσχατα, of course is the Greek expression of an "extreme."

Another passage may be cited from Plato with the superlative itself attached to the subjunctive:—

Τούτου δ' ὅρος ἐστὶν ἆρα, ὃς ἂν πλεῖστον ἀργύριον ἐργάσηται. —*Hippias Major*, 283, B.

In the next passage from the *Memorabilia*, proof positive, in a manner not to be mistaken, is produced, that whatever the modern Germans may have written about the subjunctive, the ancient Greeks themselves had no doubt or difficulty about it:—

Ἄνθρωποι ἐθέλουσι πείθεσθαι, οὓς ἂν ἡγῶνται βελτίστους εἶναι. Καὶ γὰρ ἐν νόσῳ, ὃν ἂν ἡγῶνται ἰατρικώτατον εἶναι, τούτῳ μάλιστα πείθονται. Καὶ ἐν πλοίῳ οἱ πλέοντες, ὃν ἂν κυβερνητικώτατον. Καὶ ἐν γεωργίᾳ, ὃν ἂν γεωργικώτατον. Καὶ ἐν ἱππικῇ, ὃς ἂν μάλιστα εἰδὼς φαίνηται ἃ δεῖ ποιεῖν, τούτῳ ἐθέλουσι πείθεσθαι.—iii. 3, 9.

In all these departments of human activity, the most *superlatively* distinguished are described by the subjunctive. Xenophon, in other parts of his works, furnishes examples almost endless:—

πορευτέον δ' ἡμῖν τοὺς πρώτους σταθμοὺς ὡς ἂν δυνώμεθα μακροτάτους.—*Anab.* ii. 2, 12.

It will be remembered that πρῶτον as a particle of time with the subjunctive has been adduced again and again from Homer and Xenophon, proving how completely independent of indefiniteness is the subjunctive. In the following instance from Xenophon, the *first* person who crosses is definitely indicated by the subjunctive:—

ὃς ἂν πρῶτος ἐν τῷ πέραν γένηται.—*Id.* iv. 3, 29.

Πρῶτος too is a superlative, and the first place in a

large army is surely an exceptional and extraordinary place.

The next two examples are too clear to need any comment:—

αὐτοὶ δὲ συμβολῆς ἕνεκεν συμβαίνοντες ὡς ἂν δύνωνται τάχιστα.—Lib. iv. 2, 1.

ἡμεῖς δ' ὑμᾶς, ἐπειδὰν ἐκεῖσε ἥκητε, δεξόμεθα ὡς ἂν δυνώμεθα κάλλιστα.—Lib. iv. 6, 35.

In addition to the instances already given from Xenophon illustrative of those most distinguished in different departments of human activity, another may be given descriptive of those most distinguished in the chase:—

εἶτα, ὅστις ἂν ᾖ τῶν παρόντων ἐμπειρότατος καὶ ἐγκρατέστατος, τῷ προβολίῳ παίειν.—*Ven.* 10, 1.

Hippolytus, who was distinguished in the same field, thus won the *superlative* regard of the great huntress Diana:—

> *ὃς ἂν μάλιστα φίλτατος κυρῇ βροτῶν*
> *τόξοις ἀφύκτοις τοῖσδε τιμωρήσομαι.*—*Hip.* 1421.

Such sentences as those just given are found in hosts in Herodotus. Though the father of "History," he loved a good story, and consequently was very fond of superlatives. The first example proves at once the truth of the first combination in this treatise as well as the present one:—

τὰς δὲ γυναῖκας τῶν ἐπιφανέων ἀνδρῶν ἐπεὰν τελευτήσωσι, οὐ παραυτίκα διδοῦσι ταριχεύειν, οὐδ' ὅσαι ἂν ὦσι εὐειδέες κάρτα.—*Eut.* ii. 89.

Here Herodotus, regarding death as occurring only

once in the life of men or women, while the German theory represents it as an act of "indefinite frequency," and hence as an extraordinary event, expresses it by the subjunctive—*ἐπεὰν τελευτήσωσι.* In the very next clause, women of extraordinary beauty are described by the same mood—*ὅσι εὐειδέες.* An extraordinary person and extraordinary point of time are alike described by the subjunctive. In the fourth book of the same history there is a passage precisely parallel to the above. The woman who pleases the king above her fellows is described by the same mood :—

ἥ δὲ ἂν βασιλεῖϊ ἀρεστὴ γένηται.—*Melp.* 168.

In these sentences, women remarkable for extraordinary beauty are described. In the following sentence, a man remarkable for extraordinary size and strength is described. The ordinary mood for extraordinary description is, of course, the subjunctive :—

τὸν ἂν τῶν ἀστῶν κρίνωσι μέγιστόν τε εἶναι, καὶ κατὰ τὸ μέγεθος ἔχειν τὴν ἰσχύν, τοῦτον ἀξιοῦσι βασιλεύειν—iii. 20.

In the next passage the possession which Polycrates prized above all others is similarly described :—

φροντίσας τὸ ἂν εὕρῃς ἐόν τοι πλείστου ἄξιον.—*Id.* 40.

The last passage but one to be cited here from Herodotus contains two illustrative instances in close contiguity pointing to the same conclusion :—

ἥ δὲ ἂν τὰ πλεῖστα ἔχῃ ἀρίστη ἄυτη.

ὅς δ' ἂν αὐτῶν πλεῖστα ἔχων διατελέῃ.—*Clio,* 32.

The last passage contains not only the same mood

with the same combination, but almost the very same words. So familiar to the Greeks was the peculiar function of the subjunctive :—

ὅς ἄν αὐτῶν πλεῖστα κατάσχῃ.—*Id.* 89.

In these instances, the extreme in the direction of greatness is equally certain and conspicuous. In the following quotation from Thucydides, the extreme in the direction of smallness is equally certain and conspicuous :—

καὶ ἧς ἄν ἐπ' ἐλάχιστον ἀρετῆς πέρι ἢ ψόγου ἐν τοῖς ἄρσεσι κλέος ᾖ.—ii. 45.

The same celebrated oration of Pericles, in honour of those whose fate it was to fall fighting for father-land, contains another case combining the same characteristics :—

τὸ δ' εὐτυχες, οἳ ἂν τῆς εὐτυχεστάτης λαχώσιν.
—*Id.* 44.

Plato, Sophocles, and Xenophon, when called into court to give evidence relative to ἔσχατα and the subjunctive, corroborate each other. Xenophon and Euripides bear the very same testimony to περιττά coupled with the subjunctive, which, of course, of itself means something "excessive :"—

ὃν δ' ἄν περισσὸν καὶ φρονοῦνθ' εὕρῃ, μέγα.—*Hip.* 445.

ἃ ἄν ἴδω περιττὰ ὄντα τῶν ἐμοὶ ἀρκούντων, τούτοις τὰς ἐνδείας τῶν φίλων ἐξακέομαι.—*Cyr.*

The practice of coupling a superlative itself, expressive, of course, of an extreme, prevails from the time of Homer to Plutarch, who, when he contradicts certain theorists, is accused of writing bad Greek.

An example of each may be given to close this part of the argument :—

ὅς κεν ἀρίστην
βουλὴν βουλεύσῃ.—*Homer.*

καταλείψω τὴν βασιλείαν τούτῳ, ὅς ἂν ὑμῶν ὀξυτέραν ἔχῃ τὴν μάχαιραν.—*Plut.* 184.

In the subjoined examples there is no superlative, but the persons, indicated in a manner not to be mistaken, are certainly extraordinary for evil or for good.

ὅ τίς κ' ἐπίορκον ὀμόσσῃ.—*Il.* iii. 279.

That a man who forswears himself is an extraordinary personage, is as true as that the subjunctive is here employed to describe him. Nor is this a single, solitary instance. The description is found elsewhere in the immortal poem :—

αἳ ὑπὸ γαῖαν
ἀνθρώπους τίνυνται, ὅτις κ' ἐπίορκον ὀμόσσῃ.—xix. 260.

However wide the distance is that divides Epic from Comic poets, they meet in describing extraordinary personages by the subjunctive. The person just described by the prince of Epic poets, is not more extraordinary than the person now to be described by the prince of Grecian Comic poets :—

ὅς ἂν πεπλήγῃ τὸν πατέρα νεοττὸς ὤν.—*Aris. Av.*

The son who strikes his father is certainly a very extraordinary personage. Not less extraordinary an instance of an opposite extreme is the personage whom Plato describes as bound not to retaliate, *whatever* provocation he may receive :—

οὐκ ἀνταδικεῖν δεῖν, ὁτιοῦν πάσχῃ.—*Crito*, 10, C.

A person caught in the act of crowning with chaplets a dead body, in spite of a prohibition imposing the penalty of death, would certainly be placed in an extraordinary position :—

ὃς ἂν νεκρὸν τόνδ' ἢ καταστέφων ἁλῷ.

—*Eur. Phœn.* 1632.

Those whose houses are smitten by the gods are certainly placed in an extraordinary position :—

οἷς γὰρ ἂν σεισθῇ θεόθεν δόμος.

—*Phil.* 585.

Xenophon, in a single sentence, represents a commander as choosing himself, and then condemning others to death without a trial. Surely this must have been an extraordinary personage. Both acts are described by the subjunctive :—

ὅστις δ' ἂν ἑαυτὸν ἕληται στρατηγόν, . . .
οὗτος ἔσται ἱκανὸς κατακανεῖν ὃν ἂν ὑμῶν ἐθέλῃ ἄκριτον.

—*An.* v. 7, 28.

Only one instance more of this combination, the relative with the subjunctive, will be cited here. In itself, however, it is a host, equal to a hundred others. It will be remembered that in the preceding combination, ὅταν and ἐπειδάν were constantly found indicating the period of death by means of the subjunctive, because it is an exceptional or extraordinary event, occurring as it does only once in the life of men, although the German theory represents it as occurring oftener than once, indeed an act of "indefinite frequency." But while all men once part with life, there are few who take the lives of others,—a still more

extraordinary act. The following line introduces such an act, of course, by the subjunctive:—

καθαρὸς ἅπας τοι πολεμίους ὃς ἂν κτάνῃ.—*Ion*, 1334.

It is now time to make an end of citation in proof of the truth of this combination of the subjunctive; not because the end of the examples in the Greek writers has been reached, but because the end of the reader's patience would be reached long ere that limit. Enough, it is hoped, has been cited to show that ὅς, with the subjunctive, is essentially the same as *qui* with the subjunctive. What is extraordinary, whether in the shape of a conception or a fact, is indicated by the subjunctive. The Greeks were somewhat fond of making the representation in the shape of a conception rather than a fact. When the essential idea associated with the subjunctive had been more fully and formally developed by the Romans, it was indicated as much in the shape of absolute fact as of mere conception.

III. THE CONDITIONAL SUBJUNCTIVE.

In the German Grammar of Kühner, which was cited at the commencement of this treatise, there is found still further the following statement:—

Ἐάν with subjunctive differs very little from εἰ with ind. future, hence we find both forms in the same paragraph:—οἱ δὲ Θεράποντες ἐπιστάμενοι τὸν τρόπον αὐτοῦ, κατακρύπτουσι τὸν Κροῖσον, ἐπὶ τῷδε τῷ λόγῳ, ὥστε, εἰ μὲν μεταμελήσει τῷ Καμβύσῃ καὶ ἐπιζητήσει τὸν

Κροῖσον, οἱ δὲ, ἐκφήναντες αὐτόν, δῶρα λάμψονται ζωάγρια Κροῖσον, ἢν δὲ μὴ μεταμέλῃται μηδὲ ποθῇ μιν, τότε καταχρῆσθαι.—*Hd. I.* iii. 36.

On this modern dogma here enunciated no comment will be made, save that it is contradicted by the best of all evidence, and therefore cannot be correct. The very evidence cited to confirm it, confutes it. The two forms, though occurring in the same paragraph, so far from conjoined by any natural affinity, are only confronted that they may be contrasted with each other. The form εἰ μὲν μεταμελήσει τῷ Καμβύσῃ implies, in a manner not to be mistaken, that it was *natural that Cambyses should repent.* The words would imply that anywhere, but here it is expressly stated, Θεράποντες ἐπιστάμενοι τὸν τρόπον αὐτοῦ, whereas the form ἢν δὲ μὴ μεταμέλῃται μηδὲ ποθῇ implies, in a manner not less to be mistaken, that the contrary course *was wrong, and not expected.* The mere form would imply that anywhere, but the subsequent context proves it:—ἐπόθησέ τε δὴ ὁ Καμβύσης τὸν Κροῖσον.

The coincidence in this combination between the Latins and Greeks is not less perfect and complete than in the two already considered. The Greeks and Latins at least distinguished between the indicative and subjunctive moods, and assigned a separate and special function to each. Horace, in the two succeeding clauses, confirms Herodotus in the two preceding clauses:—

Atqui *si* vitiis *mediocribus* ac mea paucis
Mendosa *est* natura.—*Sat.* vi. 65, lib. i.
Si quid *miri faciat* natura.—v. 102.

In the former clause, the supposition introduced by *si*, and the indicative *est*, is indicated by the word *mediocribus* itself to be of an ordinary and natural character. On the other hand, in the latter clause, the very word *miri* proves, in a manner not less to be mistaken, that the supposition introduced by *si* and the subjunctive is of a strange or extraordinary character.

It is sufficiently notorious, even to those who have but a moderate and mechanical knowledge of the Greek language, that εἰ is seldom found with the subjunctive. Indeed that usage is assuredly extraordinary. Nor is the supposition thus introduced by εἰ with the subjunctive less extraordinary. It is right that Homer should first be cited to give testimony on this point:—

Εἴπερ γάρ τ' ἄλλοι γε περικτεινώμεθα πάντες.

—*Il.* xii. 245.

In the two preceding combinations, instance after instance of death, the most extraordinary event in the life of man, because it only happens once, was introduced by the subjunctive. But here the supposition of a whole army being slain is made by εἰ and the subjunctive.

In the same book the two following lines are found:—

εἴπερ τε πύλας καὶ τεῖχος Ἀχαιῶν
Ῥηξόμεθα σθένεϊ μεγάλῳ εἴξωσι δ' Ἀχαιοί.—*Il.* xii. 225.

The smashing of gates, and the battering down of walls by sheer strength, also come under the category of the exceptional and extraordinary.

The next quotation is very significant:—

Εἴποτε δ' αὖτε
χρειὼ ἐμεῖο γένηται ἀεικέα λοιγὸν ἀμῦναι
τοῖς ἄλλοις.—i. 340.

Achilles here anticipates the advent of what might be likened to a Roman dictatorship, when in an extraordinary emergency one man was required to decide the destiny of his countrymen. This position is indicated by εἰ with the subjunctive. Farther on in the same immortal poem, Menelaus conceives himself closing in combat, single-handed, with Hector and his compatriots. The same mood too, of course, is found:—

Εἰ δέ κεν Ἕκτορι μοῦνος ἐὼν καὶ Τρωσὶ μάχωμαι
Αἰδεσθείς, μήπως με περιστείωσ' ἕνα πολλόι.—xvii. 95.

From the other poem of Homer another illustrative instance may be adduced:—

καὶ εἴποθι μεῖζον ἕλησι
Κῆτος.—*Od.* xiii. 96.

Here, as often in the preceding combination, the comparative implies something greater than usual.

This usage of εἰ, peculiar to the subjunctive, appears equally certain and conspicuous at the next stage of development in the Greek language—in the pages of Pindar and Æschylus,—

εἰ γὰρ ἅμα κτεάνοις πολλοῖς ἐπίδοξον ἄρηται κῦδος.
—*Nem.* ix. 40.

The possession of great wealth with great glory certainly constitutes an exceptional and extraordinary condition. The prince of Lyric poets, like the prince

of Epic poets, indicates such a condition by means of εἰ with the subjunctive. In the passage from which the next extract is taken, Pindar praises Homer, through whose pages the hero Ajax and the favoured few find their passport to immortality. The happy condition is again introduced by εἰ with the subjunctive:—

τοῦτο γὰρ ἀθάνατον φωνᾶεν ἕρπει,
εἴ τις εὖ εἴπῃ τι.—*Isth.* iii: 59.

Cicero represents Alexander, when standing beside the grave of Achilles, as saying,—

O *fortunate*, inquit, adolescens, qui tuae virtutis Homerum praeconem *inveneris*.—*Pro Archia*, 10.

The Greek, in the former quotation, represents what is peculiarly fortunate as a conception. The Roman, in the latter quotation, represents what is peculiarly fortunate as a fact. Whether that which is introduced by the subjunctive be a fact or a conception is immaterial. It is the character only of the conception or fact which determines its mood.

The next and last citation from Pindar contains the only two conditions which could make life (in his opinion) completely happy:—

δύο δέ τοι ζωᾶς ἄωτον
μοῦνα ποιμαίνοντι τὸν ἄλπνιστον εὐανθεῖ σὺν ὄλβῳ,
εἴ τις εὖ πάσχων λόγον ἐσλὸν ἀκούσῃ.—*Isth.* iv. 15.

Two citations may be made from Æschylus, on which there can be only one opinion,—they completely confirm the testimony of Pindar:—

ΧΟ. πῶς ἂν ἐκ τούτων ἔτι
πρᾴσσοιμεν ὡς ἄριστα Περσικὸς λεώς;

ΔΑ. *εἰ μὴ στρατεύοισθ' ἐς τὸν Ἑλλήνων τόπον,*
μηδ' εἰ στράτευμα πλεῖον ᾖ τὸ Μηδικόν.
—*Persæ*, 790.

In these two lines the distinction is well drawn between the optative and subjunctive. In the latter, the supposition is extended to its farthest limit,—"no, *not even if* the Median force be the larger."

The remaining example from Æschylus explains itself:—

δεινὴ γὰρ ἐν βροτοῖσι κἀν θεοῖς πέλει,
τοῦ προστροπαίου μῆνις, εἰ προδῶ σφ' ἑκών.
—*Eum.* 234.

Here, as often elsewhere, it is not left to inference, but expressly stated, that the supposition is an extraordinary or exceptional one. The betrayal by a god, who was bound to protect him, of a suppliant, would certainly be "dreadful."

In the following example from the logical Sophocles, who, like Dryden, reasoned in verse, the verb in the subjunctive contains the word itself expressive of excess,—*ὑπέρ*:—

ὕβρις, εἰ πολλῶν ὑπερπλήσθῃ μάταν.—*Œd. Tyr.* 874.

Such is the difference between *εἰ* with the indicative, and *εἰ* with the subjunctive, the same as that between *si* with the same moods in Latin. And as *ὅτε* and *ἐπεί*, when compounded with *ἄν* = *ὅταν* and *ἐπειδάν*, uniformly take the subjunctive, as has already been seen, introducing something exceptional or extraordinary, so *εἰ*, when compounded with *ἄν*, uniformly takes the subjunctive. The subjoined illus-

trative instances will show that ἐάν introduces precisely the same idea as ὅταν in the first combination, and ὅς ἄν in the second, considered above. It will be remembered that ὅταν or ἐπειδάν was found, with the subjunctive, introducing the most precise specifications of time, in opposition to the German doctrine of "indefinite frequency." The following examples with ἐαν are equally fatal to that notion:—

ἐάνπερ ἅπαξ λάβωμέν τι τοῦ ὄρους.—*Xen. An.* iv. 6, 17.

ἅπαξ, of course, = semel, *once*, and once only, entirely excludes the notion of "indefinite frequency." And that a work of extraordinary difficulty is here indicated by the subjunctive λάβωμεν, is proved by the preceding clause οὐκ ἄβατόν ἐστι τὸ ὄρος.

Another example in the *Anabasis* is equally clear and conclusive:—

ἦν γὰρ ἅπαξ δύο ἢ τριῶν ἡμερῶν ὁδὸν ἀπόσχωμεν.—ii. 2, 12.

Here is ἅπαξ again. Hence there can be no "indefinite frequency." The army of the Greeks was in great danger. The distance of a two days' march to divide them from the army of the king would be nothing less than their deliverance. This is well indicated by the subjunctive ἀπόσχωμεν. The clause that follows proves this—οὐκέτι μὴ δύνηται βασιλεὺς ἡμᾶς καταλαβεῖν.

The same word ἅπαξ is found with the subjunctive in Hippocrates:—

οὐ γὰρ ἔτι ἐπίληπτον γίνεται ἢν ἅπαξ ἐπισημανθῇ.

—*De Morbo Sacro*, p. 306.

The next examples equally exclude the notion of "indefinite frequency," for ἐάν, like ὅταν or ἐπειδάν, is

constantly found introducing, by means of the subjunctive, death—an event occurring only once in the life of man, and hence extraordinary.

It is right here, as heretofore, to give the precedence to Homer, the oldest witness:—

ἀλλά μοι αἰνὸν ἄχος σέθεν ἔσσεται, ὦ Μενέλαε
αἴ κε θάνῃς.—*Il.* iii. 170.

As men only die once, so they can only be killed once. Homer gives as little countenance to the notion, that a man can be killed an "indefinite number of times" as that he can die oftener than once:—

οὐ γὰρ ἐγώ σ' ἔκπαγλον ἀεικιῶ, αἴκεν ἐμοὶ Ζεὺς
δώῃ καμμονίην, σὴν δὲ ψυχὴν ἀφέλωμαι.—xxii. 256.

On this point, as on many others, the prince of Tragic poets confirms the prince of Epic poets:—

ἦν γὰρ θάνῃς σύ, καὶ τελευτήσας μ' ἀφῇς.—*Ajax*, 496.
ἦν μὴ θάνω 'γὼ πρόσθεν, οὐχὶ παύσομαι.—*Œd. Col.* 1040.

There could not be conceived a stronger and more striking case than the following from Euripides. Not only is it a case of murder, but of the murder of a father:—

πατρὸς γὰρ, ἦν κτάνῃς ἔσει φονεύς.—*Ion.* 527.

And:—

κἂν μὲν κτάνω τόνδ', οἶκον οἰκήσω μόνος.—*Phœn.* 1246.

Two other instances from Euripides may be given:—

ἦν δ' ἐγγὺς ἔλθῃ θάνατος, οὐδεὶς βούλεται
θνήσκειν.—*Alces.* 670.
ὡς, ἦν θάνῃς σύ, παῖς ὅδ' ἐκφεύγει μόρον.
—*And.* 381.

Prose writers only confirm poets on this point.:—

Νόμιζε δέ, ἂν ἐμὲ νῦν ἀποκτείνῃς, δι' ἄνδρα δειλόν τε καὶ πονηρὸν ἄνδρα ἀγαθὸν ἀποκτείνων.—*Anab.* vi. 6, 24.

The illustrative instances given above, of dying and being killed, with the subjunctive, extraordinary events, because occurring only once, bear a close affinity to acts which entail death as a penalty. These too are expressed by the subjunctive. The author last quoted furnishes them in great abundance:—

ἐὰν δέ τις ἀνομίας ἄρξῃ, ἄγεσθαι αὐτοὺς ἐπὶ θανάτῳ.—v. 7, 34.

καὶ ἐάν τις μείνῃ ἢ ἀπολιπὼν ληφθῇ πρῖν ἐν ἀσφαλεῖ εἶναι πᾶν τὸ στράτευμα, κρίνεσθαι αὐτὸν ὡς ἀδικοῦντα.—*Id.* 6, 33.

δόγμα ἐποιήσαντο, ἐάν τις τοῦ λοιποῦ μνησθῇ δίχα τὸ στράτευμα ποιεῖν, θανάτῳ αὐτὸν ζημιοῦσθαι.—*Id.* vi. 4, 11.

Analogous to this is capture in the very act of stealing:—

νόμιμόν ἐστιν, ἐὰν ληφθῆτε κλέπτοντες, μαστιγοῦσθαι.—*Id.* iv. 6, 15.

Æsop, who is often accused of writing bad Greek by certain theorists when he contradicts their theories, on this point coincides with the practice of his predecessors:—

πέπωκα (μυῖα) καὶ λέλουμαι, κἂν ἀποθάνω, οὐδὲν μέλει μοι.

The very same words are found in the orator Antipho, with the addition of καταληφθείς. All men die once, but only very few are condemned to death:—

ἐὰν καταληφθεὶς ἀποθάνω.—cxvii. 20.

As in the two previous combinations, the very words in Greek expressive of excess, ὑπέρ, etc., *comparatives*, *superlatives*, were found conjoined with the subjunctive, so it is in the present :—

ἦν δ' ἐς τὸ πρῶτον πόλεος ὁρμηθεὶς ζυγὸν
ζητῶ τις εἶναι.—*Ion.* 595.

ἐὰν δὲ μείζων ἡ πρᾶξις τῆς πρόσθεν φαίνηται καὶ ἐπιπονωτέρα καὶ ἐπικινδυνοτέρα.—*Anab.* i. 3, 19.

τὰ σκληρὰ γάρ τοι, κἂν ὑπέρδικ' ᾖ, δάκνει.—*Ajax*, 1119.

The testimony of Thucydides too is very telling :—

ἢν μή τι ἀπὸ Πελοποννήσου ἢ ἄλλα παρὰ λόγον γίγνηται.—i. 65.

Nor is this all. In the very same book there is another instance precisely parallel :—

ἄλλως τε κἂν παρὰ δόξαν ὁ πόλεμος μεκυνήται.—141.

Here παρὰ λόγον, παρὰ δόξαν, "contrary to calculation," "to expectation," accompany the subjunctive, whose proper function it is to indicate what rises above or falls below a common standard. There is a passage in the second book of the same immortal work which only confirms the two just cited, where the speaker represents the Athenians as already the most powerful people on the globe, who might *still extend* their power :—

ἢν ἐπὶ πλέον βουληθῆτε.—62.

The next citation from Xenophon is so clear and conclusive as not to need any explanation. It only requires to be read—

ἐάν τε γάρ τις μέγας οὕτως οἴηται εἶναι ὥστε κύπτειν τὰς πύλας διεξίων, ἐάν τε οὕτως ἰσχυρὸς ὥστ' ἐπιχειρεῖν οἰκίας

αἵρεσθαι, ἢ ἄλλῳ τῷ ἐπιτίθεσθαι τῶν πᾶσι δήλων ὅτι ἀδύνατά ἐστι, τοῦτον μαίνεσθαι φάσκειν.—*Mem.* iii. 9, 7.

Often the word μέγας, "on a large scale," or πολλή, "in great force," is joined to the subjunctive:—

ἦν δι' αὐτὸν (*i.e.* Darius) στόλος μέγας πλέῃ ἐπὶ τὴν Ἰταλίην.—*Herod.* iii. 138.

Κύπρις γὰρ οὐ φορητόν, ἢν πολλὴ ῥυῇ.—*Hip.* 443.

ἀλλ' ἄνδρα χρή, κἂν σῶμα γεννήσῃ μέγα
δοκεῖν πεσεῖν ἄν, κἂν ἀπὸ σμικροῦ κακοῦ.—*Ajax*, 1077.

ῥᾳδίως γὰρ αὐτὸν οἴσω, κἂν πνέων ἔλθῃ μέγα.
—*Bach.* 140.

In the two last illustrative instances, besides the word μέγα, there is also κἄν, "even if," *i.e.*, an extreme supposition. The following citations all contain this common characteristic:—

ἀλλ' ἐξιχνεύσουσίν σε, κἂν ἔλθῃς λάθρα.—*Id.* 817.

οὐδ' ἦν Ἀγαμέμνονα εἴπῃς
ὃς νῦν πολλὸν ἄριστος ἐὺ στρατῷ εὔχεται εἶναι.
—*Il.* i. 90.

The most extreme case conceivable is here put, and, of course, the subjunctive is employed for that purpose.

The very same words are found in the Hippolytus of Euripides:—

ἐν τοῖσδ' οὐκ ἔνεστ' ἄνηρ ἐμοῦ,
οὐδ' ἦν σὺ μὴ φῇς, σωφρονέστερος γεγώς.—995.

The bold Antigone will bury her brother *even* in the face of a state prohibition:—

ἐγώ σφε θάψω, κἂν ἀπεννέπῃ πόλις.—*Phœn.* 1657.

In the next citation from the same poet, besides

κἄν there is also ὅταν, confirming the illustration of that particle in the first combination of the subjunctive considered in this work :—

δουλοῖ γὰρ ἄνδρα, κἄν θρασύσπλαγχνός τις ᾖ,
ὅταν ξυνειδῇ μητρὸς ἢ πατρὸς κακά.—*Hip.* 425.

Teucer also, like Antigone, is brave enough to bury a brother *even* in spite of a prohibition from the authorities :—

ἀλλ' ἀρήγετ' ἔστ' ἐγὼ μόλω
τάφου μεληθεὶς τῷδε, κἄν μηδεὶς ἐᾷ.—*Ajax*, 1184.

κἄν λάβῃς μ' ἐψευσμένον,
φάσκειν ἔμ' ἥδη μαντικῇ μηδὲν φρονεῖν.
—*Œd. Tyr.* 461, 462.

With the speech of Tiresias may be compared that of Creon in the same play :—

ἐάν με τῷ τερασκόπῳ λάβῃς
κοινῇ τι βουλεύσαντα, μή μ' ἁπλῇ κτάνῃς.—*Id.* 605.

Here, the idea of a prince of the blood plotting against, and a priest lying to, their sovereign, is indicated by the subjunctive. In the *Philoctetes*, the idea of a priest telling lies is again indicated by the same mood :—

ἢ δίδωσ' ἑκὼν
κτείνειν ἑαυτόν, ἣν τάδε ψευσθῇ λέγων.—1342.

In the following instances the character of the supposition is inferred from the consequence that follows. The power of the cause is estimated from the effect. The two first are taken from the poet last quoted, that most correct thinker and clear writer, Sophocles :—

ἐὰν δ' ἀπῇ
τούτων τὸ χαιρειν, τἄλλ' ἐγὼ καπνοῦ σκιᾶς
οὐκ ἂν πριαίμην ἀνδρὶ πρὸς τὴν ἡδονήν.—*Ant.* 1169.
πολλῷ γε μᾶλλον, ἢν φράσω, διόλλυμαι.
—*Œd. Tyr.* 1159.

ἐάν τίς τινος παρῇ ἔργου καιρόν, διόλλυται.
—*Plato*, Rep. ii. 370, C.

ἀντιπέμπει πρὸς ταῦτα ἡ Φαιδίμη φαμένη κινδυνεύσειν μεγάλως, ἢν ποιῇ ταῦτα.—*Herod.* iii. 69.

τὸ μὲν γὰρ πλῆθος πολύ, καὶ κραυγῇ πολλῇ ἐπίασιν. ἂν δὲ ταῦτα ἀνάσχησθε, τὰ ἄλλα καὶ αἰσχύνεσθαί μοι δοκῶ οἵους ἡμῶν γνώσεσθε τοὺς ἐν τῇ χώρᾳ ὄντας ἀνθρώπους.—*Anab.* i. 7, 4.

κἂν τοῦτ', ἔφη, νικῶμεν, πάνθ' ἡμῖν πεποίηται.—*Id.* 8, 12.

The same sentiment and syntax are found in Thucydides :—

καὶ ἢν νικήσωμεν, οὐ μή ποτε ὑμῖν Πελοποννήσιοι ἐς τὴν χώραν ἄνευ τῆς τῶνδε ἵππου ἐσβάλωσιν.—Lib. iv. 95.

Not less certainly or conspicuously in this combination than in the two already considered, the extreme is seen in the shape of something good or evil :—

κἂν μὲν τάδ' ἡμῖν ἐκπονουμέναισιν εὖ
πόσις ξυνοικῇ μὴ βίᾳ φέρων ζυγὸν
ζηλωτὸς αἰών, εἰ δὲ μὴ θανεῖν χρεών.—*Medea*, 241.

The following extracts furnish clear examples of a good extreme :—

ἢν μὲν ἔλθῃ πύστις εὐτυχὴς σέθεν,
ὀλολύξεται πᾶν δῶμα.—*Eur.*, Elect. 690.
ἢν ὁ θεὸς εὖ διδῷ.—*Cyr.* iii. 1, 34.

The same word *συμβαίνω* with *ἄν* presents either extreme :—

ἄν τι συμβῇ, if any thing should happen, *i.e.*, disaster or death.—*Dem.* 551, 15.

ἢν συμβῇ ἡ πεῖρα, *i.e.*, should the effort be crowned with success.—*Thuc.* 3, 3.

The following are rather conspicuous cases of the opposite extreme :—

οὐδ' ἢν χρῄ με πᾶν παθεῖν κακόν.—*Philoct* 999.

τί γάρ, ἐὰν πορθῶσι χώραν τὴν ἐμήν.—*Id.* 1404.

Reverence to parents is a duty enforced in every code of ethics and expected by every state. The neglect of this duty the Athenians indicated by the subjunctive :—

ἐὰν δέ τις γονέας μὴ θεραπεύῃ, τούτῳ δίκην πόλις ἐπιτίθησι. —*Xen.*, Mem. ii. 2, 13.

The grave moralist is divided from the comic wit by a wide distance, but they unite on the subjunctive. Xenophon indicates the omission of a duty to a parent by the subjunctive; Aristophanes indicates the commission of an indignity to a parent by the subjunctive :—

ὃς ἂν πεπλήγῃ τὸν πατέρα νεοττὸς ὤν.—*Av.*

The commission of sacrilege, or treason, or any other enormous crime is constantly indicated by the subjunctive. Let one sentence suffice :—

ἐάν τις ἢ πόλιν προδιδῷ ἢ τὰ ἱερὰ κλέπτῃ κριθέντα ἐν δικαστηρίῳ, ἂν καταγνωσθῇ, μὴ ταφῆναι ἐν τῇ Ἀττικῇ, τὰ δὲ χρήματα αὐτοῦ δημόσια εἶναι.—*Xen.*, Hel. i. 7, 23.

That a father should kill a son is fully as extraordinary as that a son should strike his father. This propensity in a Persian king is also indicated by the subjunctive :—

ὦ βασιλεῦ, ἢν δὲ πολλὰ τοιαῦτα ποιέῃς, ὅρα ὅκως μή σευ ἀποστήσονται.—*Her.* iii. 36.

The last sentence to be quoted at this stage of the argument contains two of the three evils out of which David was compelled to make choice—war and famine, extraordinary evils assuredly :—

ἢν δέ γε οἶμαι ποτε ἄλλος πόλεμος καταλάβῃ Δωρικὸς τοῦδε ὕστερος καὶ συμβῇ γενέσθαι λιμόν, κατὰ τὸ εἰκὸς ᾄσονται.—*Thuc.* ii. 54.

Such is the subjunctive with ἐάν. The fact that ὅταν and ἐάν are found only with the subjunctive, proves, in a manner not to be mistaken, that the ancient Greeks, by universal and unanimous consent, assigned a peculiar province to that mood, like the Latins,—the expression of something exceptional or extraordinary. Before proceeding to the consideration of another combination, a single passage may be cited from Homer, containing within its brief compass confirmations of the three combinations now considered. So familiar was the idea in question to the mind of the Greeks :—

Ὁππότ' ἀνὴρ ἐθέλῃ πρὸς δαίμονα φωτὶ μάχεσθαι.

—*Il.* xvii. 98.

It requires no proof to prove that fighting with a god is extraordinary. Such an event is not "frequent" whether definite or "indefinite." The

very next line in Homer contains an example of the second combination considered :—

"Ον κε θεὸς τιμᾷ, τάχα οἱ μέγα πῆμα κυλίσθη.—99.

It was not every one in the Trojan army that was loved by a god, but only the favoured few.

The first line of the passage here quoted contains a confirmation of the combination last considered—the conditional :—

"Ω μοι ἐγών, εἰ μέν κε λίπω κατὰ τεύχεα καλά,
Πάτροκλον θ', ὃς κεῖται ἐμῆς ἕνεκ' ἐνθάδε τιμῆς.—91.

The second line of this quotation shows that the act contemplated in the first would have been execrable as well as extraordinary.

IV. THE SUBJUNCTIVE FOR OPTATIVE.

The combination now to be considered only confirms the three that have been considered above, and it in turn is confirmed by the subjunctive of the Latins. This combination has engaged the attention of a triumvirate, which contains the German Hermann, the English Paley, and the Scottish Sandford. Of each the writer desires not only to speak in terms of respect, but even admiration. It is a delight as well as a duty. To scholarship at once extensive and exact, Hermann added an acuteness of perception perhaps not surpassed by any of his countrymen. The editor of Euripides has shown so much courage and capacity, tempered with so much caution,

as to be worthy of the best days of English scholarship. Although almost thirty years have passed away since the brilliant and all-accomplished Sandford ceased to fill the chair in Glasgow, yet traditions of his fine expansive enthusiasm, his love of Greek, which never left him even to the last, still live on the lips of many. The doctrine, however, of these distinguished scholars is contradicted by the ancient Greeks, and therefore cannot be correct. Their inference is based on a very insufficient induction, and they have mistaken an occasional and accidental adjunct for an essential and universal property. The late Sir Daniel Sandford says, "The subjunctive is occasionally put after a verb of past time in the chief proposition, but only when the *sense* is really present."—*Hom. and Attic Greek*, p. 231.

Hermann in a note on the *Hecuba*, line 27,—

> κτείνει με χρυσοῦ τὸν ταλαίπωρον χάριν
> ξένος πατρῷος, καὶ κτανὼν ἐς οἶδμα ἁλὸς
> μεθῇ, ἵν' αὐτὸς χρυσὸν ἐν δόμοις ἔχῃ,—

says, "Conjunctivus non tam consilium Polymnestoris indicat, quam possideri nunc ab eo aurum."

Mr Paley sanctions this opinion by offering none of his own. It is impossible that the circumstance of present time can account for the subjunctive, for the absence of this accidental and occasional adjunct does not prevent the occurrence of the subjunctive. Thucydides, when called into court to defend the accuracy of his own native speech against

foreigners, treats their theory with great fairness, but no mercy:—

ἐπαναχωρῶν δὲ ὁ Ἀριστεὺς ἀπὸ τῆς διώξεως, ὡς ὁρᾷ τὸ ἄλλο στράτευμα ἡσσημένον, ἠπόρησε μὲν ὁποτέρωσε διακινδυνεύσῃ χωρήσας, ἢ ἐπὶ τῆς Ὀλύνθου ἢ ἐς τὴν Ποτίδαιαν, ἔδοξε, etc.—Lib. i. 63.

Here the subjunctive διακινδυνεύσῃ, being an aorist, and representing a single momentary act, entirely excludes the notion of "purpose entertained in the past, and falling in the present, and existing in it, or an effect lasting and continuing up to the present time in relation to the speaker." The venerated Arnold has no note on this singularly significant passage, but his implicit confidence in the judgment of Bekker has been completely justified by adopting his reading. Many editors adopt the optative διακινδονεύσαι, supposing that the historical or past tense ἠπόρησε requires that mood. It was not without good reason that Thucydides used the subjunctive rather than the optative in opposition to the rule that obtains in ordinary cases. Bekker, who probably was not equalled, certainly not exceeded by any man in Europe, in experience of manuscripts, was thus enabled to ascertain the correct reading. The writer has not hitherto had the good fortune to have access to the MSS. of Thucydides, but the reading given above is corroborated by reading and comparing Thucydides with Thucydides. In the seventh book of the Peloponnesian War there is found not only the same mood under the same circumstances, but

the very same word—ἐβουλεύοντο εἴτε διακινδυνεύσωσι.—Chap. i.

The two Greek historians Herodotus and Xenophon confirm in every point the testimony of Thucydides:—

ὁ δέ οἱ ἠπείλησε, ἢν σῶς ἀπονοστήσῃ πολλόν μιν χρόνον παρθενευέσθαι.—iii. 124.

In the two citations from Thucydides, the subjunctive was found, not with "the sense really present," as Sir Daniel Sandford alleged, but with a past act; here it is found ἢν ἀπονοστήσῃ, with the sense future; and Xenophon says:—

ἔλεγεν ὅτι ἕτοιμος εἴη ἡγεῖσθαι αὐτοῖς, ἔστε δ' ἂν μόλωσιν, εἰς ἀφθονίαν σιτία παρέξειν.—*An.* vii. 1, 33.

Of course, what has just been said of ἢν ἀπονοστήσῃ applies to μόλωσιν. Thus the subjunctive is used not only where there is *no* "present sense," but, although preceded by a past tense, used where the optative might have been expected. It will soon be seen that the question of time is a secondary and subordinate one. The subjunctive occurs in each of the two following sentences, though not preceded by the same tense; for while it follows a presential tense in the first sentence, it follows a past tense in the second:—

ἐγώ σφε θάψω, κἂν ἀπεννέπῃ πόλις.—*Phœn.* 165.

ἔφη ἀπολέεσθαι κάκιστα, ἢν μή σφεα ποιήσῃ.—*Clio*, 112.

Here, despite the difference of tense, there is a coincidence in the mood, which is the main point. The coincidence is due to the presence of that powerful principle, that the syntax should be subordinate to the sense. This principle caused the suspension

of the ordinary rule, that the *optative follows* historical tenses in the instances given above.

The following is an additional example equally striking:—

καὶ δεῖται αὐτοῦ μὴ πρόσθεν καταλῦσαι πρὸς τοὺς ἀντιστασιώτας πρὶν ἂν αὐτῷ συμβουλεύσηται.—*Anab.* i. 1, 10.

Here, in oblique narration, the optative might have been expected instead of the subjunctive. There must have been something peculiar about the subjunctive, when ordinary rules were thus suspended to meet its requirements. Ordinary rules are only suspended for extraordinary reasons. It is only for extraordinary reasons and on extraordinary occasions that politicians suspend the *Habeas Corpus* in Ireland. As the *Salus populi est suprema lex* with politicians, so is the paramount principle with philologists,—that the syntax must be subordinate to the sense. The Latins and Greeks alike agree on this point. In the following passage from Livy, an ordinary rule in Latin is suspended for the expression of something extraordinary by the subjunctive:—

Se millies morituros potius quam ut tantum dedecoris admitti patiantur.—Lib. iv. 2.

Here the ordinary rule, "Conjunctions couple like moods," requires *passuros esse*, but the subjunctive *patiantur* is employed to deprecate the commission of the most extreme disgrace. The parallel holds in the case of πρότερον ἤ among the Greeks. Herodotus says:—

Ἦσαν γὰρ Δαρείῳ, καὶ πρότερον ἢ βασιλεῦσαι, γεγονότες τρεῖς παῖδες.—vii. 2.

Here the simple statement of a fact, in no way exceptional or extraordinary, is made by the inf. *βασιλεῦσαι.* In the next citation from the Father of History, the usage is very striking:—

Ἥ (*συντυχίη*) *μιν παύσει καταστρέψασθαι τὴν Εὐρώπην πρότερον ἢ ἐπὶ τέρμασι τοῖσι ἐκείνης γένηται.*—*Id.* 54.

Here, even though there is a preceding infinitive *καταστρέψασθαι*, yet *πρότερον ἢ* is not followed by *γενέσθαι*, but the subjunctive *γένηται.* Of course, Herodotus dispensed with the ordinary construction that he might indicate the extraordinary conception of Xerxes reaching the remotest bounds of Greece.

The same distinction must be drawn between *πρίν* with the indicative and subjunctive. Homer, the father of poetry, says:—

Τήν δ' ἐγὼ οὐ λύσω, *πρίν μιν καὶ γῆρας ἔπεισιν.*—*Il.* i. 29.

Herodotus, the father of history, says:—

ἐγὼ οὐ πρότερον παύσομαι, πρὶν ἢ ἕλω τε καὶ πυρώσω τὰς Ἀθήνας.—vii. 8.

Homer and Herodotus, though using the same conjunctive particle, use different moods. But there is as great a difference between the moods as between the acts described. There is surely a wide difference between old age coming on a captive concubine in the course of nature, and Xerxes capturing the capital of Greece and consuming it with raging fire. Another noted instance still of a departure from the ordinary construction to indicate an extraordinary circumstance, is found in the verb *παραγγέλλω.* Those who have got their knowledge of Greek from Greek writers,

and not from grammars or lexicons, know that that verb is far most frequently followed by the infinitive. If reference be made to that common book of reference, *Liddell and Scott*, it will be found that, while there is a host of references to παραγγέλλω with the infinitive, there is only one to it with ὅπως. While the passage thus referred to fully justifies the change of construction, a citation is here made not to be found in the Oxford oracle:—

οἱ ἕνδεκα Σωκράτῃ παραγγέλλουσιν, ὅπως ἂν τῆδε τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τελευτήσῃ.—*Plato*, Phædo, 59, B.

Such a death as that of Socrates had not occurred before, nor occurred after, at Athens, and therefore is entitled to be called and considered an extraordinary event. Here, again, the parallel between the Greek and Latin languages is perfect. It is sufficiently notorious that the regular construction of *jubeo* is with the inf. Its usage with the subjunctive is quite extraordinary. It is, however, found in Cicero to introduce an extraordinary command:—

Hic tibi in mentem non venit, *jubere ut* haec quoque *referret*, H.S. VI. milibus D. se tibi vendidisse? in Ver. iv. 12.

Cicero here suggests the issue of a command by Verres, which would have been a notorious lie. This coincidence between the Greeks and Latins in practice, in deviating from ordinary rules only under certain circumstances, when they wished to indicate something exceptional or extraordinary, cannot have been the result of chance, but of a design common to both.

It is now time to give additional illustrative instances of the substitution of the subjunctive for the optative. The testimony of no one is more telling on this point than that of Thucydides :—

καὶ πολλάκις τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις παρῆνει, ἢν ἄρα ποτὲ κατὰ γῆν βιασθῶσι, καταβάντας ἐς αὐτὸν ταῖς ναυσὶ πρὸς ἅπαντας ἀνθίστασθαι.—Lib. i. 93.

Here the subjunctive *βιασθῶσι* is used, though preceded by the historical tense *παρῆνει*. The reason is so obvious as to occur to any one. The history of Athens proves that it was only on a very extraordinary occasion that its inhabitants were *compelled* to leave the land and defend themselves by "wooden walls." It will be observed, moreover, that the subjunctive is introduced by *ἤν*, a form restricted to that mood. The next citation from the same historian is equally conclusive and decisive :—

ἐλευθέρωσίν τε γὰρ ὑπισχνεῖτο αὐτοῖς, ἢν συνεπαναστῶσι.—*Id.* 132.

A revolt among slaves is commonly considered an extraordinary rather than an ordinary act. As in other cases already considered, so in this, the historian of the Persian war is at one with the historian of the Peloponnesian war :—

Σόλων ἀπεδήμησεν ἔτεα δέκα, ἵνα μή τινα τῶν νόμων ἀναγκάσθῃ λῦσαι τῶν ἔθετο.—*Clio*, 28.

Here, Herodotus, like Thucydides, associates the subjunctive with the idea of compulsion. Now, compulsion is not a common but an uncommon thing in a free state. But the sentences which

exemplify the substitution of the subjunctive admit of a closer classification than merely sentences containing the common characteristic of something extraordinary or exceptional. Where a vow, oath, or proclamation is, there the subjunctive follows almost as a matter of course :—

Ἀργεῖοι ἐποιήσαντο κατάρην, μὴ πρότερον θρέψειν κόμην πρὶν ἂν Θυρέας ἀνασώσωνται.—*Clio*, 82.

Here the recovery of Thyrea was the all-exclusive aim. The solemn imprecation was subordinate to this.

The next proclamation contains a command enjoining the indiscriminate slaughter of old and young :—

ὁ δὲ παρήγγειλε τῇ στρατιῇ, πάντα τὸν ἂν λαβώσι, καὶ ἄνδρα καὶ παῖδα, ὁμοίως κτείνειν.—*Thalia*, 147.

Xenophon, of course, follows in the track of his two historical predecessors :—

ἐκήρυξεν, ὅστις ἂν ἁλῷ ἔνδον ὢν τῶν στρατιώτων, ὅτι πεπρά-σεται.—*An.* vii. 36.

Public proclamations, whether issuing from court or camp, usually contain intimations of high importance, and do not occur every day. Especial prominence was given to these by the employment of the subjunctive. Here, too, the Romans only corroborate the practice of the Greeks. It is notorious that it was only in extraordinary emergencies that such a proclamation as this was made by the Romans :—

Dictator dedit operam, ne quid respublica detri-

menti capiat. Here the subjunctive occurs in both clauses.

But the peculiar function of the subjunctive is never more clearly seen than when it is placed beside the optative after the same tense :—

ἐπειρωτᾶν, εἰ στρατευήται—καὶ εἴ τινα προσθέοιτο φίλον. —*Her.* i. 53.

This is the passage to which Dr Arnold referred when he said (Thucyd. ii. 5) "the passage so well explained by Hermann" (App. to Viger, sec. xi.) The optative there expresses "greater uncertainty." Here the doctrine is laid down by Hermann and approved by Arnold, that the difference between the subjunctive and optative is, that the latter implies more "uncertainty" than the former. The objection offered to this opinion here, is, that it is contradicted by facts. These facts are furnished by the Greeks themselves, who surely knew how to write their own language. The Greeks expressly employed the subjunctive to indicate "uncertainty," not the optative:—

πᾶ βῶ; πᾶ στῶ; πᾶ κέλσω;—*Eur. Hec.* 1057.

Here the speaker is in great "uncertainty," as a murderer might be expected to be, but he has no uncertainty about the use of the moods. Thrice he uses the subjunctive to express his "uncertainty," but never once the optative. Indeed, so notorious is this usage that grammarians have called it the Subjunctivus *dubitativus* or *deliberativus;* and yet Hermann, followed by Arnold, has associated greater certainty with the subjunctive than the optative.

Before explaining the passage from Herodotus, on which Hermann bases his doctrine, a passage from Xenophon has to be cited:—

παρήγγειλεν ὅτι οὗτος ἄριστος ἔσοιτο ὃς ἂν πρῶτος ἐν τῷ πέραν γένηται.—An. iv. 3, 29.

If the doctrine of Hermann and Arnold be correct, then the optative *ἔσοιτο* indicates "greater uncertainty" than the subjunctive *γένηται*. Now, so far is the optative from introducing "greater uncertainty," that what it introduces follows with the utmost *certainty*, when the preliminary of the preceding subjunctive has been realized, as a matter of course. Here, as in Latin, the subjunctive, so far from being "subordinate" to another mood, subordinates another mood to it.

The key to the right interpretation of the passage from Herodotus is to be found in *εἰ στρατευήται*. As already remarked, it is notorious that *εἰ* with the subjunctive is an exceptional and extraordinary usage. On the other hand, *εἰ* with the optative is quite an ordinary usage, *e.g.*, *εἴ τινα φίλον προσθέοιτο*. As might have been expected, the suppositions introduced by *εἰ* respectively with these two moods here correspond to these usages respectively. In *εἰ στρατευήται* there is an extraordinary supposition, for its realization cost Crœsus his throne. In *εἰ συνθέοιτο*, there is a very ordinary supposition, for Crœsus, as might have been expected, got a friend when he asked for one (*Her.* 69). The primary and paramount consideration is the undertaking of the expedition against Cyrus;

the secondary and subordinate consideration is the acquisition of an ally. If there were no expedition, there would be no need of an ally. If there were, the other would follow *certainly*, as a matter of course.

The practice of the Father of History on this point is confirmed by the Father of Poetry, even though the language in his time was at the very earliest stage of logical development:—

"Εκτορι γάρ οἱ θυμὸς ἐβούλετο κῦδος ὀρέξαι
Πριαμίδῃ, ἵνα νηυσὶ κορωνίσι θεσπιαδὲς πῦρ
Ἐμβάλῃ ἀκάματον, Θέτιδος δ' ἐξαίσιον ἀρὴν
Πᾶσαν ἐπικρήνειε.—*Il.* xv. 599.

To say, according to Arnold and Hermann, that the optative ἐπικρήνειε expresses more uncertainty than the conjunctive ἐμβάλῃ, is to say the reverse of what is right. For whenever the purpose of the subjunctive is fulfilled, that of the optative follows with absolute *certainty* as a matter of course. The optative, as in the preceding cases, is secondary and subordinate to the primary and paramount purpose of the subjunctive.

Another example may be cited in confirmation from an Attic poet:—

πηγὰς ποταμίας μετέρχομαι
ὡς ὕβριν δείξωμεν Αἰγίσθοῦ θεοῖς
γόους τ' ἀφείην.—*Eur. El.* 56.

The precedence is here given to the gods by the subjunctive. Euripides knew Greek too well, and what was due to the national theology, to make the gods secondary and subordinate to the utterance of howling.

It is somewhat strange that what the venerated Dr Arnold wrote in favour of the theory of Hermann on one page should have been contradicted on the other. On the one page (p. 187, vol. i.), Arnold wrote "the conjunctive intimates an impression that an event will happen, although the thing be still uncertain." Thucydides, however, on the other page, wrote:—

ὁρῶντες δ' αὐτοὺς οἱ Πλαταιῆς ἀπειλημμένους, ἐβουλεύοντο εἴτε κατακαύσωσιν.—Lib. ii. 4.

Here, although an historical tense precedes, the subjunctive is found instead of the optative. A sufficient and satisfactory reason for deviation from the ordinary practice, is found in the fact that burning one's neighbours alive is rather an exceptional and extraordinary act. Surely Thucydides, by using the subjunctive, could never have "intimated an impression" that the Plataeans could burn the Thebans alive. It is well known that Dr Arnold was an exceedingly humane man, and therefore it is far more probable that he would have thrown his theory into the fire, than that he could have imagined that the Plataeans would have thrown the Thebans there. Thucydides himself states that they did no such thing.

IV. THE SO-CALLED "DELIBERATIVE" SUBJUNCTIVE.

Between the subjunctive of "indefinite frequency," which has already been dealt with in detail, and the subjunctive of "deliberation," what connexion can there be? The mood has but one form in Greek; what natural or necessary connexion is there between the two attributes, "indefinite frequency" and "deliberation"? Whatever amount of "deliberation" the German Kühner may have bestowed on the subject, the writer, after much "deliberation," can see no more connexion between the two than between them and the angle of polarization or the electric telegraph. Not only, however, does this oracle assign attributes to the subjunctive which can have no natural or necessary connexion with each other, but he assigns attributes to it as opposed to each other as light to darkness, truth to falsehood, good to evil. It is stated (Greek Grammar, vol. ii. p. 78), "the conjunctive in all its persons is used to express a question implying *doubt*." It is stated (*Id.* p. 470), "the conjunctive gives a *certain*, the optative only a probable result." Thus the student who desires to know for certain, without doubt, what is the function of the subjunctive, is told at one time that it expresses doubt, at another time certainty.

From the illustrative instance already given above of this so-called deliberative subjunctive, it will readily appear that it coincides with all the combinations of

the subjunctive considered in this treatise. The instance quoted was:—

πᾶ βῶ; πᾶ στῶ, πᾶ κέλσω;—*Hec.* 1056.

The position of a murderer is certainly exceptional and extraordinary, and is correctly and characteristically indicated by the subjunctive.

The condition of an outcast from one's native country is equally exceptional and extraordinary:—

ποῖ γὰρ τράπωμαι, πατρίδος ἐκβεβλημένη.—*Bac.* 1365.

A journey beneath the earth falls under the same category:—

τίνα φυγὰν χθονὸς ὑπὸ σκοτίων μυχῶν πορευθῶ.

—*Ion*, 1237.

The position of a mortal escaping the punishment of a god would certainly be exceptional and extraordinary:—

καὶ πῶς τὰ κρείσσω θνητὸς οὖσ' ὑπερδράμω;—*Ion*, 973.

Admetus is in doubt whether he shall touch his wife raised from the dead. That is certainly an extraordinary condition:—

θίγω, προσείπω ζῶσαν ὡς δάμαρτ' ἐμήν;—*Alc.* 1131.

A child running from the murderous hands of a mother is in an extraordinary position:—

ποῖ φύγω μητρὸς χέρας;—*Medea*, 1271.

A young lady about to be dragged away against her will is certainly in a position no less extraordinary:—

οἴ μοι τάλαινα, ποῖ φύγω; ποίαν λάβω
θεῶν ἄρηξιν, ἢ βροτῶν;—*Œd. Col.* 828.

This usage is as old and orthodox as Homer himself, for it occurs in the Odyssey:—

ὤ μοι ἐγώ, τί πάθῳ; τί νύ μοι μήκιστα γένηται;—v. 465.

Ulysses was certainly in a very extraordinary condition, for Homer says he could neither breathe nor speak—*ἄπνευστος καὶ ἄναυδος.*

The thoughtful reader will have observed that every one of these questions, though "direct," is in the subjunctive mood. Grammarians say that "direct" questions are followed by the indicative. The Greeks and Romans, who surely understood their native speech better than foreigners, were guided in their choice of a mood by a consideration of the character of the question. The coincidence on this point between the Greeks and Romans is complete. Euripides says:—

εἰπώμεν ἢ σιγώμεν;—*Ion*, 758.

Virgil says:—

Eloquar an sileam?—*Æn.* iii. 39.

Of course, the speaker here is in an extraordinary position. The learned reader will remember a "voice is heard from a tomb."

The practice of prose writers on this point coincides with the practice of poets. The testimony of Thucydides, a host in himself, will suffice:—

οἱ ἄνθρωποι οὐκ ἔχοντες ὅ τι γένωνται.—ii. 52.

Of course, the mood implies what the state of the men was, but there is an express intimation of the fact, moreover, for the immediately preceding words are:—

ὑπερβιαζομένου γὰρ τοῦ κακοῦ.

Another illustrative instance may be cited in con-

firmation, if confirmation were necessary, from the fifth book:—

οὐκ εἶχον ὅ τι εἰκάσωσιν, *i.e.*, did not know what to make of it.—Cap. lxv.

Thus, four separate combinations of the subjunctive, different but not diverse, regularly recurring forms of expression, examples of which occur in almost every page of every Greek writer, have been found all containing the common characteristic of something exceptional or extraordinary. The first combination considered contained the element of time. It was found that "indefinite frequency" could not be an essential characteristic of the subjunctive, for the time of death is constantly indicated by the subjunctive in Greek, an event which can occur only once in the life of man.

A new example will now be given, excluding with equal certainty the idea of indefiniteness:—

ἐγὼ δέ, ὁπόταν καιρὸς ᾖ, ἥξω παρ' ὑμᾶς.—Xen., *An.* vii. 3, 36.

Here it is not any time whatever that is indicated, but only *καιρός*, the right moment, which occurs of course only once. The careful reader of Plato will remember at least one instance of *καιρός* with the subjunctive, which could not have more clearly confirmed the interpretation, though it had been written for that purpose:—*ἐὰν τίς τινος παρῇ ἔργου καιρόν, διόλλυται*, *i.e.*, if a man lets slip the right moment for a work, it never returns.—*Rep.* ii. 370, B. A few lines farther down, in the same passage, *καιρός* again is found with

the subjunctive, and the same temporal particle as in the passage just quoted from Xenophon :—*ὅταν εἷς ἐν καιρῷ πράττῃ.* The second and third combinations—the relative with the subjunctive—the conditional *ἐάν* with the subjunctive—are contained in one and the same sentence from Plato :—

ἐάν τις θυμῷ δοῦλος δεσπότην αὑτοῦ κτείνῃ, τοὺς προσήκοντας τοῦ τελευτήσαντος χρωμένους τῷ κτείναντι χρείαν ἣν ἂν ἐθέλωσι.—*Legg.* ix. 9.

The subjunctive is used in this relative clause, not because there *is no definite* manner specified by which the homicide is to be treated, but because the relatives of the deceased have full power to treat him in *whatever* manner they like. It is seldom that citizens have *unlimited*, and therefore *extraordinary* power. As clauses of this class seem at first sight adverse to the new doctrine taught in this treatise, one or two additional instances will confirm the interpretation now given :—

ὁρκίοισι γὰρ μεγάλοισι κατείχοντο, δέκα ἔτεα χρήσεσθαι νόμοισι τοὺς ἄν σφι Σόλων θήται.—*Her.* i. 28.

It was not every person from whom the Athenians would take any law whatever. This was assuredly an extraordinary amount of confidence reposed in Solon. A sentence precisely parallel to this is to be found in the first book of the Anabasis :—

τῷ ἡγεμόνι πιστεύσομεν ᾧ ἂν Κῦρος δῷ.—i. 3, 16.

Here, too, it would have been an extraordinary amount of confidence to have intrusted their lives to any guide whatever from Cyrus.

But the cumulative evidence in the shape of coincidence between the Greek and Latin subjunctive is not yet complete. The two following sentences taken from one play in Aristophanes are not explained by the notion of "doubt or deliberation," but by a comparison with the Latin subjunctive:—

ἐγὼ πρίωμαι τῷδε;—*Ran.* 1229.

ἐγὼ σιωπῶ τῷδε;—*Id.* 1134.

The meaning of the first is—"Am I to buy to serve him?" *i.e.*, the idea of me doing anything so absurd and extraordinary! The meaning of the second is—"Must I hold my tongue to please this fellow?" *i.e.*, the idea of doing anything so absurd and extraordinary! The Latin is precisely parallel—Ego te videre noluerim?—*Cicero Quint.*, *Fr.* i. 3—*i.e.*, the absurd and extraordinary idea of me being unwilling to see you, my brother!

Moreover, the coincidence between the Greek and Latin subjunctive extended even to the expression of an extreme in the shape of something greatly to be *desired* or *dreaded;* for although the Greeks, who first conceived the expression of an exceptional or extraordinary idea by the subjunctive, employed the optative specially for the expression of something to be greatly desired or dreaded, not having developed the subjunctive to the same extent as the Latins, they nevertheless employed the subjunctive for that purpose also:—

εἴθ' ἕλωσί με.—Soph., *Phil.* 1095.

And, in like manner, the other extreme is found in the third person :—

μὴ γένηται.—*Her.* viii. 10.

Nothing could be more certain or conspicuous than the presentation of the two extremes—one a thing greatly to be desired, the other a thing greatly to be dreaded—in the following pair of sentences :—

ἀλλ' ἐλευθέρως θάνω.—*Herac.* 559.
μὴ δῆτα ἀδικηθῶ.—*Œd. Col.* 174.

The thoughtful reader will observe that the first person is used here. Therefore, to call the mood "hortative" would be to contradict reason. Men exhort others, not themselves.

Equally unmistakable is the following instance :—

ἐπίσχετ, αὐδὴν τῶν ἔσωθεν ἐκμάθω.—*Hip.* 567.

Phædra, in her extremity, exclaims,—"I would gladly catch the words of those within."

Equally unmistakable is the other extreme in the two following lines :—

μήδ' ἀλγυνθῶ.—*Troad.* 172.
μήδ' αὐτοῦ θάνω.—*Trach.* 802.

Before passing to the detailed consideration of the Latin subjunctive, it is not only desirable, but necessary, to show, moreover, that the Greek subjunctive is used for the simple *future*. In several singularly significant sentences the subjunctive and future are found in juxtaposition, and in the distinction to be drawn is to be found the progressive development which the subjunctive has undergone, when it reappears in the

periods of the Latin writers. In the first place, one or two sentences will be given where the future might have been expected. It will be seen that the change is made under the same conditions, and for the same reasons, as in the cases considered above :—

Εἰ δέ κε μὴ δώωσιν, ἐγὼ δέ κεν αὐτὸς ἕλωμαι.—*Il.* i. 137.

Ἦ τεόν, ἢ Αἴαντος, ἰὼν γέρας, ἢ Ὀδυσῆος.

That a commander-in-chief should prey on the property of his subordinates, is certainly an act somewhat exceptional and extraordinary. It may be remarked that the first clause just confirms the second, and all that has been said above. Εἰ with the subjunctive implies that if the Grecian chiefs did not do what they were bound to do, they would be doing something strange and exceptional. In the same book the same poet has the same construction :—

Αἷς ὑπεροπλίῃσι τάχ' ἄν ποτε θυμὸν ὀλέσσῃ.

—*Id.* 205.

That a commander-in-chief should take away the life of his lieutenant is, at least, not less exceptional and extraordinary than if he should take away his property. Let it not be imagined for a moment that Homer desired to use the subjunctive, because his verse required it. Plato, who was not fettered in the choice of forms by metrical necessities, employs the same form of expression :—

οὔ τ' ἔστιν, οὔτε ποτε γένηται κρεῖττον.—*Legg.*, p. 942.

That, also, must be exceptional and extraordinary

which is never to be exceeded in the experience of future ages. Before commenting on the distinction drawn by the Greeks between the indicative and the subjunctive, another sentence must be cited from the Father of Poetry, the same in syntax and sentiment as that from the Father of Philosophy:—

οὐ γάρ πω τοίους ἴδον ἀνέρας οὐδὲ ἴδωμαι.

—*Il.* i. 262.

Thus, Homer and Plato alike agree in using the subjunctives, γένηται, ἴδωμαι, instead of γενήσεται, ὄψεται, to indicate what is never to have a parallel in the future, while they employ the indicatives ἔστι, ἴδον, to indicate what is unparalleled when in the shape of a past act. What was past and present was familiar, what was future was unseen and unknown, and it is well known that "omne *ignotum* pro *mirifico*." The Greeks chose to represent the exceptional or extraordinary in the form of a future conception by means of the subjunctive. The idea associated with the subjunctive, when transmitted to the Latins, reappears in their pages completed, not changed, in obedience to the law of progressive development. The Greeks began by using the subjunctive to represent the exceptional or extraordinary under the form of a future conception, the Latins ended by using the subjunctive to represent the extraordinary or exceptional in the shape of a past act as well as a future conception. The Greeks said:—

μίμνετε δ' εἰσόκεν ἄστυ μέγα Πριάμοιο ἕλωμεν.

The Latins said :—

Trepidationis aliquantum edebant, *donec* timor ipse quietem *fecisset.*

Here Homer represents what is extraordinary under the form of a future conception, while Livy represents the same under the form of a past act without qualification, limitation, or reserve. Herodotus says :—

οὐ πρότερον πάυσομαι, πρὶν ἢ ἕλω καὶ πυρώσω τὰς Ἀθηνάς.

Cæsar says :—

Neque prius fugere destiterunt quam ad flumen Rhenum milia passuum ex eo loco circiter quinque *pervenerint.*

The Greeks said :—

καί μοι τοῦτ' ἀγόρευσον ἐτήτυμον, ὄφρ' εὖ εἰδῶ.

The Latins said :—

Omnia ita explicavit, ut satis *intelligerem.*

But it is now time to pass to the consideration of the subjunctive of the Latins in detail.

V. THE SUBJUNCTIVE OF THE LATINS.

To all the functions of the Latin subjunctive, so many in number, so different in nature, hitherto believed by grammarians, since they have been dealt with in detail by the writer elsewhere, it is neither necessary nor desirable to refer here. There are two, however, the most notorious of all, "indefiniteness and dependence," which must be subjected to searching scrutiny. In the former of these, the

writer had not ceased to believe when he wrote the first part of his first treatise on the subjunctive. Against the latter of these, subsequent study has furnished fresh arguments.

It has already been seen that the subjunctive in Greek is wholly independent of "indefiniteness." The same result will be seen with respect to the subjunctive in Latin. After due deliberation, there are, first of all, two facts which raise grave doubts whether the Latin subjunctive has any essential connexion with "indefiniteness":—

1. The imperfect indicative constantly represents an indefinite act,—*e.g.*, Socrates dicebat, *i.e.*, "Socrates from time to time would say."

2. The most indefinite words are constantly found with the indicative.

Virgil says,—Quicquid id est, *i.e.*, "whatever that may be." Nothing could be more indefinite than what is here expressed by the indicative. The indicative implies that what is left indeterminate is *immaterial* to his argument. The same sentiment, and of course the same syntax, are found in the prose writer Livy, who certainly was not fettered in the choice of his forms by metrical considerations:—"Utcunque erit," Prefatio, *i.e.*, "However that may be." Livy does not trouble himself about the issue, but proceeds with his work. Thus the indicative is constantly found with the most *indefinite* specifications. On the other hand, the subjunctive is found with the most *definite* specifications:—Ipse

paucos post annos confectus morbo atque aetate *quum* sibi finem vitae adesse *intelligeret.*—Sal., *Jug.* ix.

Here the historian descends to the most definite details,—the specification of a date among other circumstances. Sallust, like his Grecian predecessors, moreover, here disposes of the modern German doctrine of "indefinite frequency" in connexion with the subjunctive:—Micipsa only died once. Cicero also disposes of the doctrine in a manner not to be mistaken:—

Praeterita enim aetas, *quum effluxisset.*—*De Sen.* ii. 4.

And still in the same treatise:—

Cyrus *moriens quum* admodum senex esset.—*Id.* ix. 30.

Animus semper prospiciebat, quasi, *quum excessisset* e vita, tum denique victurus esset.—xxiii. 82.

Virgil, too, deals a blow equally decisive against this doctrine:—

Pergama *quum peteret* inconcessosque Hymenaeos. —*Æn.* i. 655.

Helen was not in the habit of crossing over to Troy in company with another man than her husband. She went once—an act sufficiently exceptional and extraordinary.

So far were the Latins like the Greeks from associating indefiniteness with the subjunctive, that they employed it to indicate the day of the completion of a contract:—

Intellexit diem instare, *quo die* frumentum militibus metiri *oporteret.*—Cæsar, *Bell. Gal.* i. 16.

Not only is a precise day definitely indicated by the subjunctive, but even the very approach of day or night:—

At in urbe *prima luce*, *cum* civitas in foro expectatione erecta *staret*.—*Livy*, iii. 47.

The same sentiment, the same syntax, and almost the same words are found in the same history:—

Igitur die judicii, *cum* plebs in foro erecta expectatione *staret*.—Lib. ii. 54.

In the next citation, Cæsar indicates the approach of night by the subjunctive:—

Quum finem pugnandi *nox* fecisset.—Lib. ii. 6.

Not only is the day or hour definitely indicated by the subjunctive, but even the very moment:—

Jam in eo *esset* ut in muros miles evaderet.—*Livy*, ii. 17.

Quum jam in eo *esset* ut potiretur oppido.—Nep., *Mil.* 7.

So much for the "indefinite" subjunctive. Since the absence of the indefinite element does not prevent the occurrence of the subjunctive, it is impossible that its presence can produce it. When anything indefinite is found with the subjunctive, then it is only an accidental circumstance. It is not an essential and universal property.

In the following additional illustrative instances, it will be seen at once that it is the character of the act that determines the mood:—

Postero die dictator, *quum ante lucem* in forum venisset.—*Livy*, vii. 27.

It certainly was an extraordinary act in an extraordinary magistrate to come into the forum before dawn of day.

In each of the two following extracts the extraordinary spectacle of a son executed by the command of a father is presented, and in either case by means of the subjunctive:—

Itaque, velut emerso ab admiratione animo, *quum* silentio defixo stetissent.—*Livy*, viii. 7.

Quum inter omne tempus pater, vultusque, et os ejus, spectaculo *esset*.—*Livy*, ii. 5.

There is a class of sentences which, while remarkable in other respects, being remarkable also for seeming to countenance this notion of an "indefinite subjunctive," requires to be considered here. These sentences are found in Greek as well as in Latin. One of them has already been given:—

Ἔσσεται ἦμαρ, ὅτ' ἄν ποτ' ὀλώλῃ Ἴλιος ἱρή.—*Il.* vi. 448.

So, in Latin, Livy says:—

Dum *dies* ista venit, *qua* magno conatu exercitus *moveatis*.—viii. 7.

Here, it might be urged, that no specific day is mentioned, and that what is predicated by the subjunctive is only a conception. These are mere accidents so far as the subjunctive is concerned. Cæsar, in his brief, business-like style, proves this:—

Ac fuit antea *tempus* cum Germanos Galli virtute superarent.—*Bel. Gal.* vi. 23.

Here Cæsar states a past historical fact at a definite period by means of the subjunctive, and an extraordi-

nary fact, contrary to his own personal experience, for in his time the Germans conquered the Gauls, not the Gauls the Germans. The two first sentences contain a conception, the last a fact; but there is an element common to all, and this essential property explains the subjunctive. These sentences, like those given at the close of the Greek subjunctive, illustrate the progressive development of the subjunctive. The Greeks at first expressed an extraordinary conception, the Latins at last expressed an extraordinary fact, by means of the subjunctive. The examples in proof of this point are endless. Enough has been cited, it is hoped, to prove that the subjunctive in sentences of the kind is dependent not on time definite or indefinite, but on the character of the act described. One or two brief sentences will show that *time* is quite secondary and subordinate, and that the nature of the act described is primary and paramount:—

Olympiae per stadium ingressus esse Milo, dicitur quum humeris *sustineret* bovem vivum.—Cic., *De Sen.* x. 33.

That nation certainly would be an extraordinary nation which should consider the carriage of a live ox on the shoulders of a man an ordinary act. The Italians considered it an extraordinary act, and probably the Germans would do the same.

Aes Corinthium maxime laudatur; hoc casus miscuit, Corintho, quum *caperetur*, incensâ.—*Plin.* xxxiv. 3.

The burning of a town, whether Troy, London, or

Corinth, will generally be considered an extraordinary event in its history.

Cato annos quinque et octoginta natus excessit e vita, quum quidem eo ipso anno Contra Ser. Galbam ad populum summa contentione *dixisset.*—Cic., *Brut.* xx. 80.

The sight of "an old man eloquent," advanced far beyond the allotted span, whether Cato or Lord Brougham, is certainly an extraordinary one.

But the alleged "indefinite" function of the subjunctive has not yet been exhausted. It is said to extend to "indefinite" personages as well as periods of time. The late Dr Carson wrote, "The relative *qui* after *sum, reperio, invenio, etc.*, is followed by the subjunctive mood. To fulfil the conditions of this rule, the precise subjects to which the author alludes must be unknown to him, and undefined." —*Qui, Quae, Quod*, pp. 2 and 6.

In the preface to that work, the author says,— "He holds himself particularly indebted to a classical scholar, who, for extent and minuteness of information, as well in Latin as in Greek, may with confidence be asserted to have scarcely an equal in Europe." He alludes to Dr Parr, who, "though unsolicited, and a stranger to the author, most zealously patronized the former edition, and recommended it to the notice of some of the first scholars of England."

Whether this reverend gentleman recommended the book in question before reading it, or this unrivalled European scholar read it before reading

Cicero, the author, as he does not know, will not say. The interests of truth, however, require him to say, that the doctrine thus propounded and seconded is constantly contradicted by Cicero and his countrymen, and therefore cannot be correct:—

Inventus est scriba *quidam* Cn. *Flavius qui* cornicum oculos *confixerit.*—*Pro L. Mur.* xi.

Reperti sunt *duo equites Romani* (Caius Cornelius, Lucius Vargunteius) *qui* me interfecturos *pollicerentur. Cat.* i. 4.

The late Dr Carson was a most amiable man, and never willingly could have done Cicero the injustice, which his theory does him, when applied to the following sentences:—

Sapientia est enim *una quae* moestitiam ex animis *pellat.*—*De Fin.*, lib. i. 13.

"The precise subjects to which the author alludes must be unknown to him and undefined."—*Carson.*

Why, Cicero is making *wisdom* the very subject of his discourse, and to say that *wisdom* was "unknown" to the man who saved his country, is as uncharitable as it is unclassical.

Cæsar, when called into court, confirms the testimony of his countryman:—

Erant omnino itinera *duo*, quibus itineribus domo exire possent.—*Bel. Gal.* i. 6.

Now, so far is it from being correct that the subjects Cæsar writes about here are "unknown and undefined," that he defines them with all the precision of which language is capable:—

Unum per Sequanos, angustum et difficile et alterum per provinciam nostram, multo facilius et expeditius.

Indeed, Cæsar was too good a man of business to write about subjects "unknown" to him.

Nepos, who, though writing his native language, is often charged by foreign theorists with "writing bad Latin," when he contradicts their theories, follows in the footsteps of his great countrymen :—

Haec altera victoria est (apud Salamina parta) *quae* cum Marathonio *possit* comparari tropaeo.—*Them.*, c. 5.

There is a passage in Ovid, of witty memory, which disposes of the modern doctrine of Dr Carson and Dr Parr with merciless severity :—

Una est, quae reparet, seque ipsa *reseminet* ales,
Assyrii Phoenica vocant.—*Met.* xv. 319.

Here, in the first line, the poet refers to the extraordinary bird that begat itself again after five hundred years, and in the next line names it; yet Dr Carson wrote, and Dr Parr assented, "The subject must consist of *some members or other of a class which are unknown to and cannot be specified by the speaker or author.*"

It is notorious that there was only one phœnix at a time on the face of the earth.

Of course, it is the character alone of the subject spoken of, whether it represents one or a class, whether definite or indefinite, that determines the choice of the mood.

The Romans said alike :—

Una est quae ipsa *reseminet* ales,
Sunt qui patrem auctorem ejus supplicii *ferant.*

It was certainly a remarkable bird that generated its successor from its own ashes. It was certainly a no less remarkable report that represented a father suggesting or sanctioning the execution of his own son. Both, combining the element of the exceptional and extraordinary, are represented by the subjunctive. It will be remembered that two similar spectacles have already been represented by Livy in the same mood. So common among the Romans was this mode of representation as to be a matter of course :—

Cum inter omne tempus pater, et os ejus spectaculo *esset.*—Lib. ii. 5.

Cum omnes silentio defixi *stetissent.*—viii. 7.

Sallust represents an act equally extraordinary and execrable by the same mood :—

Fuere qui *dicerent* Catilinam humani corporis sanguinem circumtulisse.—*Cat.* xxii.

It is very easy to comprehend the subjunctive of the Latins and Greeks, but it is not easy to comprehend how "indefiniteness" ever could have been conceived to be an essential element of the subjunctive. Cicero, when speaking of himself, says :—

Ego, qui, sicut omnes sciunt in foro judiciisque ita *verser.*—*Divin.* xiii. 41.

Was either Cicero or his profession "indefinite?"

Again :—

Egomet, qui sero Graecas litteras *attigissem*, tamen quum Athenas *venissem*, ibi complures dies commoratus sum.—*Or.* i. 18.

Cicero here says, he learned Greek late in life. Was that "an indefinite act"? He, moreover, says that he went to Athens. Was that an act of "indefinite frequency"?

Moreover, Ovid says, when writing his own life :—

Ille ego, *qui fuerim*, tenerorum lusor amorum.—*Trist.* iv. 10.

Was the poet Ovid an "indefinite" personage?

But not even yet is the alleged "indefinite" element of the subjunctive exhausted. *Velis*, *e.g.*, means "you would wish," *i.e.*, "any one whatever might wish." But Virgil says :—

Jupiter (hospitibus nam te dare jura loquuntur)
Hanc laetum Tyriisque diem Trojâque profectis
Esse *velis*, nostrisque hujus meminisse minores.
—*Æn.* i. 735.

Was Jupiter an "indefinite" divinity?

This usage of the subjunctive contains the element common to all others. Virgil elsewhere says :—

Pelago *credas* innare revulsas
Cycladas, aut montes concurrere montibus altos.
—*Id.* viii. 691.

This is rather an extraordinary state of matters.

Horace describes a similar commotion in nature :—

Garganum mugire *putes* nemus, aut *mare* Tuscum.
—*Ep.* ii. 1, 200.

Sallust describes an analogous commotion in society by means of the same mood:—

Neque aliud alio ferri, neque mutari ac misceri omnia *cerneres.*—*Cat.* ii.

On the other hand, the opposite extreme, an extraordinary calm is indicated by the same mood. Silius Italicus, writing of the Ticino, says:—

Vix *credas* labi.—iv. 85.

And Cæsar, speaking of the Saône, says:—

Fluit *incredibili* lenitati ita ut oculis in utram partem *fluat* judicari non *possit.*—*Bel. Gal.* i. 12.

So much for the alleged "indefinite" character of the subjunctive. None of the alleged multitudinous functions of the subjunctive has stood more in the way of a correct knowledge of the Greek and Latin languages. On the best of all authority, the evidence of the Greeks and Latins themselves, this "indefinite" subjunctive must be pronounced a groundless fiction.

It is now time to approach the consideration of the doctrine of "dependence." Nothing will be said of its merit or demerit till tried by the true test, the practice of the Latin writers. Let an example be given:—

Dei dederunt ut iterum *videremus.*

Here, according to the modern dogma of dependence, *videremus* is dependent on *dederunt.* The latest and most fashionable description of this latter clause imported from Germany, a description affecting great philosophic precision of thought, repre-

sents it as "logically subordinate" to the former clause, *e.g.*,—

Quaerimus ut reperiamus.

According to the laws of logic, however, *reperiamus* really represents the *end*, *quaerimus* the means, but the means must be subordinate to the end, therefore *quaerimus* is subordinate to *reperiamus*. The subjunctive of the second clause is completely independent of the first clause, for the subjunctive is found where there is no preceding clause, *e.g.*,—

Id ubi *dixisset*, hastam in fines eorum emisit.

Here the second clause is really dependent on the first, but the indicative mood *emisit* is found in the dependent clause, and *dixisset*, the subjunctive mood, is found in the independent clause.

So much for the German doctrine of "logical subordination." The Germans, in invoking logic to the aid of "dependence," resemble the Irish in the old wars with the English, who laid up corn in a church under the superstitious belief that the sanctity of the place would render it safe. The affectation of logic in connexion with dependence is only analogous to hypocrisy, which is the homage vice pays to virtue. Logic declines to be sponsor to the spurious offspring of an erratic fancy. It hath been said, "O liberty, what crimes have been committed in thy name!" It may also be said, O logic, what fallacies have been committed in thy name!

As the two particles *ut* and *quum* introduced above in connexion with "dependence," occur so often with

the subjunctive, its true function can be best demonstrated in connexion with them. These particles so often introduce a *fact* with the subjunctive, without condition, qualification, or reserve, that they alone are sufficient to refute the notion that the "subjunctive is the mood of conception." As has already been observed, the subjunctive, originally employed by the Greeks to indicate an extraordinary conception, was so far developed by the Romans as to state an extraordinary fact as well as an extraordinary conception. This accounts for the fact, although it does not justify it, that the expression of "conception" is peculiar to the Latin subjunctive, and "subordinate" conception moreover. Nothing could be more directly the reverse of what is right than to say that the subjunctive in the following sentence expresses "subordinate conception":—

Summâ vi expugnâtum esse, *ut* tribuni militum consulari potestate et ex plebe *crearentur*. — *Livy*, iv. 35.

Here a fact, not a conception, is employed, and so far from being subordinate to anything else, everything else is subordinate to it. This was the end or *effect* for which the Commons fought long and hard. And such clauses introducing a fact occur in almost every page of every Latin writer. In the next sentence the subjunctive with *quum* is found, and so far from being subordinate either in form or fact, the following clause is subordinate to it, containing, moreover, an indicative:—

Alexander, *quum* Clitum familiarem suum *interemisset*, manus a se vix abstinuit.—Cic., *Tus.* iv. 37.

Nor can the subjunctive be called or considered a conception, for it was a terrible reality. And such clauses with *quum* and the subjunctive are found as frequently as *ut* with that mood. The true function of the subjunctive is brought out with great beauty and clearness by this usage of these two particles. By the one attention is called to the *cause*, by the other to the *effect*. In *quum interemisset* is seen the *extraordinary cause* which produced what followed, *vix abstinuit*, which is secondary and subordinate to it. On the other hand, in *ut* tribuni militum consulari potestate et ex plebe *crearentur*, is seen the *extraordinary effect*.

There are other combinations of the subjunctive which place the existence of this principle beyond a doubt:—

Nisi memoriam *exerceas*, minuitur. — Cic., *Cato Major*, vii.

Here the subjunctive indicates the *cause*, the *indispensable preliminary*, and the indicative clause is secondary and subordinate to it. In the next combination, the *cause*, the *indispensable preliminary condition, which must go before*, is also expressed by the "subjunctive," a term which expresses the very reverse:—

Antequam tibi ex tuis possessionibus tantum *reficiatur*, ut eo tueri legionem possis, nunquam eris dives.—*Parad.* vi. 1.

Such combinations as *quum interemisset*, nisi *studeas*, antequam *reficiatur*,—instances of which are constantly recurring in every Latin writer,—are completely fatal to what "subjunctive" indicates. This mood, whether postpositive or prepositive, has an idea inherent in itself, and is completely independent of anything else whatever. In the following sentence from Tacitus, the *effect* is expressed by the subjunctive placed last:—

Pugnatum longo agmine et incerto marte, donec proelium nox *dirimeret*.—*Hist.* iv. 35.

In the following sentence from Cæsar, the *cause* is expressed by the subjunctive placed first:—

Quum finem oppugnandi nox *fecisset*, Iccius nuntium ad eum mittit.—*Bel. Gal.* ii. 6.

But it so happens that the subjunctive expresses the very same fact,—the termination of a battle by night,—an extraordinary circumstance certainly. The subjunctive with *quum* either expresses something extraordinary in itself, or the cause of what follows. The next sentence from Cæsar includes both:—

Eo quum de improviso celeriusque omni opinione *venisset*, Remi ad *eum* legatos miserunt.—*Id.* 3.

The illustration of *quum* introducing a preliminary condition, the *cause* of what follows, would not be complete without a parallel usage of *ubi* in Livy:—

Id ubi *dixisset*, hastam in fines eorum emittebat.—*Id.* i. 32.

The learned reader will remember that the *fecialis*

or herald went through a set form of words, an indispensable preliminary to the commission of a hostile act against the foe.

Even where the *cause* is not followed by its natural effect, the subjunctive is used, because a power is kept in abeyance, which might have been exercised, and therefore the act comes under the category of what is exceptional or extraordinary:—

Phocion, *quum* ditissimus esse *posset*, fuit perpetuo pauper.—Nep., *Phoc.* 1.

Those who have the power to be rich, and don't exercise that power, are certainly not a common class. In the next instance, *quum* introduces an obligation not met as it ought, and therefore a strange and exceptional act:—

Qui terrores, *quum* compescere *debeant*, auxere insuper animos plebis.—*Livy*, ii. 43.

To what extent cause and effect were connected with the Latin subjunctive, let the following illustration show:—

	Discas.
(Indispensable cause)	Nisi *discas*, non doctus esse potes.
Do.	Antequam *discas*, nunquam eris doctus.
Cause, a fact, . .	Puer, quum *disceret*, doctus fuit.
Cause, a fact, . .	Puer, quum multum *didicisset*, scholam reliquit.

The first remark to be made on these sentences, every one of which is a constantly recurring formula, is that the subjunctive is wholly independent of de-

pendence. So far is the subjunctive from being subordinate to the indicative, that the indicative is subordinate to the subjunctive. In these combinations prominence is given to the cause by making the mood prepositive. In the following combinations prominence is give to the effect by making it postpositive. It is sufficiently notorious that cause precedes, effect follows :—

Expecta dum *sis* doctus (anticipated *effect*).

Puer nititur ut SIT doctus (desired *effect*).

Puer tam diligens erat ut *evaderet* doctus (actual *effect*).

Puer non cessavit donec *evasisset* doctus (actual *effect*).

Cause and effect often take a prominent place in philosophical systems, physical and metaphysical. The botanist, in describing a tree, either begins with the root and ends with the fruit, or begins with the fruit and ends with the root. The late Thomas Brown, the eminent Scottish philosopher, resolved all metaphysical questions into cause and effect. Not less certain and conspicuous is the place assigned to cause and effect by the Roman writers in their conception of the subjunctive. The subjunctive is seen equally well in either extreme. There are other extremes, moreover, which it expresses not less appropriately. The word *tantum* finds its true explanation of the apparently opposite meanings, "so great," "so little," *i.e.*, "only," in connexion with the subjunctive. It expresses a deviation from an ordinary

standard either in the direction of what is very great or very little :—

Praesidii *tantum* est, ut ne murus quidem cingi possit, *i. e.*, They have not force enough to man the wall.—Cæs., *Bel. Gal.* vi. 36.

On the other hand, the *extreme of greatness* is indicated by the same great master of Latin speech :—

Tantus subito timor omnem exercitum occupavit, ut *non mediocriter* omnium mentes *perturbaret.*—*Id.* i. 39.

The very words, *non mediocriter*, "in an extraordinary manner," formed with the subjunctive, prove what Cæsar meant by that mood. But this extreme is most frequently seen in connexion with something *greatly to be desired*, or *greatly to be dreaded*, *e.g.*,—

Consules *darent* operam, ne quid detrimenti respublica *caperet.*

It is quite notorious that this formula was employed only in extraordinary emergencies. The exertion of the consuls was assuredly a thing greatly to be desired, the suffering of loss to the state a thing greatly to be deprecated. The one clause, moreover, represents the desired *cause* (*darent operam*), the other (*detrimenti caperet*) the dreaded *effect.* It is in connexion with these particles *ut* and *ne*, which occur in almost every sentence in Latin, that the idea constantly associated with the subjunctive by the Romans is best represented. The two things, one greatly to be desired, the other greatly to be dreaded, given above, were expressed in the form of a conception; but, of course,

that was a mere accident, for in the two following sentences, the two extremes are presented by the subjunctive in the shape of an actual fact:—

Dii dederunt, *ut iterum videremus* (closing of temple of Janus, which occurred only thrice in seven hundred years, in times of peace).

Accidit ut una nocte omnes Hermae statuae *dejicerentur* (a result greatly to be deplored).

Of course, also, these particles *ut* and *ne* have no virtue in themselves to produce the subjunctive. The subjunctive is as independent of them as it is of dependence itself:—

Te *teneam* moriens deficiente manu.—*Tibul.*

They are occasional and accidental concomitants of the subjunctive, but they do not of themselves constitute the essential cause.

This hitherto mysterious mood, when compared with the English or Latin indicative, is not so mysterious after all. It occurs in English as well as in Latin. "The farmers said so," is a simple unemphatic statement. A writer, however, makes it more emphatic when he says, "it was the farmers *who said so*," and unconsciously employs the Latin subjunctive. In like manner, a Latin writer makes a simple, unemphatic statement, when he says, *nonnulli dicunt;* on the other hand, when he says, *sunt qui dicant*, he gives emphatic prominence to the description of those who say something strange or wrong. The consideration of a few cases puts this beyond doubt or dispute. A Roman writer, when

he describes something so common as to occur as a matter of course, says, *ut* aiunt, *i.e.*, as the common saying is; on the other hand, when he wishes to soften something strange or striking which he has said, he employs *ut* and the subjunctive *ut ita dicam*, *i.e.*, so to speak. But this is not all. Cicero often, when about to say something too strong, checks himself by saying, *prope dixerim*, *i.e.*, I had almost said. And Livy, in like manner, says, *affirmare* certum non *ausim*.—iii. 23.

Livy, moreover, supplies an instance of the second person expressing the same idea:—

Quicquid erat Patrum, *reos diceres* precibus plebem exposcentes.—ii. 35.

Livy here, in one sentence, disposes of the two modern doctrines of "indefiniteness" and "dependence" with great fairness, but no mercy. In the first clause, the most indefinite of all words, *quicquid*, is found with the indicative *erat;* and in the second clause, the subjunctive *diceres* is found in an independent clause. And with good reason; for quicquid erat Patrum, is = *omnes Patres;* and *reos diceres* prominently describes a very extraordinary state of matters. But it is scarcely necessary, after all that has been already written, to defend Livy's native speech against the modern theories of foreign grammarians. But the great power of the little particle *ut* in illustrating the peculiar function of the subjunctive has not yet been all described. It is not by *ut* alone that a purpose is introduced in Latin. It may be introduced in four other modes:—

Puer ivit ludos visurus.
„ „ visum.
„ ad ludos videndos.
„ ludos videndi causa.
Vir ivit *ut* Romam *videret.*

The first four modes are included as appendages in the indicative clause, whereas *ut* introduces a new clause. There is thus in this mode something exceptional as compared with the others. And it is not without reason, for it gives especial prominence to some very important or extraordinary purpose. Two sentences from Cicero will be sufficient to show this:—

Censendi causa haec frequentia convenit.—*In Ver.* i. 18.

Here there is a simple statement of people coming to be "registered," an event so common as not to need special notification by the subjunctive. On the other hand, there is an extraordinary purpose expressed in the second sentence, and, as might have been expected, due prominence is given to it by the employment of the subjunctive:—

Pylades Orestem se esse dixit, ut pro illo *necaretur.* *Lael.* 7.

In like manner, *ut* with the subjunctive introduces the edict issued by the senate to the consuls in an extraordinary emergency,—(compare Greek προαγορεύουσιν οἱ ἄρχοντες ὅς ἂν μηνύσῃ),—

Senatus edixit ut *darent* operam consules.

It is neither edixit dandam esse operam consulibus, nor jussit consules dare operam.

Here, too, it must be stated, that what is of extreme importance or indispensably necessary is introduced by the subjunctive:—

Philosophiae *servias* oportet, ut tibi *contingat* vera libertas.—*Seneca.*

Virtus necesse est vitium *aspernetur.*—*Cicero.*

On the other hand, *opus est*, "it is desirable," is most commonly followed by the infinitive. In the sentence from Seneca just quoted, there are two subjunctive clauses in juxtaposition, the one introducing the indispensable cause—*servias;* the other, the desired effect—*contingat.* The former is quite analogous to *nisi* memoriam *exerceas* or nisi *discas*, the indispensable preliminary to esse doctus already considered. Far most frequently, prominence is given to the cause and effect by being separately introduced with the subjunctive, and contrasted with clauses containing the indicative. In this way attention is at one time attracted to the cause, at another time to the effect. This variety of arrangement of which the Latin language is capable in the expression of its peculiarly logical character comes out with great beauty:—

Caesari, quum id *nunciatum esset*, eos per provinciam nostrum iter facere conari, maturat ab urbe proficisci et quam maximis potest itineribus in Galliam ulteriorem contendit, et ad Genevam pervenit.—Cæs., *Bel. Gal.* i. 7.

Here the subjunctive, *nuntiatum esset*, contains the *cause* of all that follows—maturat, contendit, per-

venit; and so far from being subordinate to these indicatives, they are subordinate to it. On the other hand, great prominence is given to the effect of the subjunctive in the following sentence:—

Summa vi expugnatum esse, ut tribuni militum consulari potestate et ex plebe *crearentur*. —*Livy*, iv. 35.

There is a large class of clauses hitherto referred to dependence (about which nothing now needs to be said), that, introducing facts by the subjunctive, resemble those introduced by *ut* in this respect, since they introduce either facts extraordinary in themselves, or those to which extreme importance is attached, *e.g.*—

Aspice, *quanta*
Voce neget? quae *sit* ficti constantia vultus?
—*Juv.* xiii. 75.

Here the poet expressly calls attention to the excessive impudence expressed by the subjunctive.

Id *quantae* saluti fuerit universae Graeciae, bello cognitum est Persico.—Nep., *Them.* ii.

Nepos, of course, is speaking of Athenian seamanship, which proved the safety of Greece when invaded by the Persian king.

Mirum *quantum* illi viro nuntianti haec, fidei *fuerit*. —*Livy*, i. 16.

Julius Proculus said that he had seen Romulus *deified*.

The following clauses indicate in a manner not to be mistaken the all-important point to which

attention is to be directed, and, as in the case of a state edict in an extraordinary emergency, by means of the subjunctive :—

Attendite, quemadmodum *dicam*. — Cic., *In Ver.* iv. i.

Magni interest quos quisque *audiat* quotidie domi. —*Id. Brut.* 58.

The coincidence in sentiment and syntax between Cicero and Livy in the following sentences is very striking :—

Qui *sis* non unde natus *sis* reputa.—I. 41.

Qui *sis* et quid facere *possis* considera.—*In Cæc. Div.* 12.

In such a sentence as the following, it would be said by many, the subjunctive expresses "doubt" :—

Quaeritur an is, qui profuit nobis, si postea nocuit, nos debito *solverit*.—*Cic.*

That is the merest accident, and has nothing to do with the subjunctive, for what is known is put in that mood :—

Nunc *scio*, quid *sit* amor.—*Virgil.*

Frater ut Æneas pelago tuus omnia circum
Littora *jactetur* . . . *nota* tibi.—*Id. Æn.* i. 663.

Different authors, by different particles, express the same meaning, *i.e.*, the all-important point to which attention is directed by the same subjunctive mood :—

Expectate dum consul aut dictator *fiat*. — *Livy*, iii. 11.

Rusticus expectat dum *defluat* amnis.—*Hor.*

65012

Expectabat si transire conarentur hostes.—Cæs., *B. C.*, ii. 34.

Cum bellum utrimque summa ope *pararent*, verti que in eo res *videretur*, utri prius arma *inferrent*.—*Livy*, i. 30.

Let none, for a moment, imagine that these clauses introduce the subjunctive because they introduce a conception. The two first clauses of this last sentence dispose of such a fancy with merciless, but well merited severity. *Pararent* and *videretur* introduce a specific fact,—of course, an extraordinary crisis is described.

It has already been remarked that the English even use the subjunctive, who, instead of the simple statement, "the farmers said so," say, "it was the farmers who said so." Of course, the simple statement of a fact falls to be made by the indicative; but if the thing in itself is extraordinary, the Latins soon find the appropriate symbol of expression. In the sentence :—

Rex *adeo* suos *non placavit*, ut eos exacerbaret,

the indicative clause contains something repudiated, for the expression of which the subjunctive is peculiarly adapted. A Roman writer, accordingly, wishing to give adequate expression to this clause, would write :—

Tantum abfuit, ut rex suos *placaret*, ut eos exacerbaret.

Another case precisely parallel is found in *nullus*. Livy says :—

Nullum genus calamitatis non editum in Volscos est.—ii. 53.

Cicero, however, who is generally admitted to have imparted to the language the perfection of formal expression, would have written :—

Nullum genus calamitatis erat, quod in Volscos non *ederetur*.

Cæsar, instead of saying *pulsum iri*, in a passage known to every schoolboy, says, Futurum esse *ut* omnes ex Galliae finibus *pellerentur*, to indicate, of course, the extraordinary act.

Forte is constantly used unemphatically with the indicative, *e.g.*, *forte* aderat. Livy, however, says :—

Forte ita casus tulit, *ut* Genucius in insidias *praecipitaretur*,—certainly not a common event.

Instead of dic mihi, *fac ut sciam* is used in pressing commands.

Why, in expanding one clause into two for the sake of extraordinary predication, the subjunctive is used rather than the indicative, may best be seen by comparing the difference of the two moods. *Fortasse* is properly used with the indicative, because it introduces something ordinary and very probable, *e.g.*,—

Sed et exorabile nomen
Fortasse experiar : *solet* his ignoscere.
—*Juv.* xiii. 103.

On the other hand, *forsitan*, because it introduces something extraordinary and highly improbable, is used with the subjunctive :—

Forsitan impensae Vinonem parcere *credas*.

The very next line shows that the supposition is wrong :—

Hoc agit ut doleas.—*Juv.* v. 157.

In the next confirmatory case from the same poet, something both strange and wrong follows fortasse :—

Forsitan expectes ut Gaditana canoro
Incipiat prurire choro, etc.—xi. 162.

Cicero expresses the same degree of improbability by *non verisimile* with the subjunctive :—

Non est verisimile ut Chrysogonus horum litteras *adamarit.*—*Rosc.* 121.

Ut does not introduce here a purpose, but the statement of a fact—of course an improbable one. On the other hand, what is very probable is introduced by the infinitive in the very same speech :—

Verisimile est, Roscios istam rem ad Chrysogonum detulisse.—*Id.* 106.

Cogere with the subjunctive introduces what is still more extraordinary :—

Catulum esse coactum *ut vita se ipse privaret.*—Cic., *Or.* iii. 3, 9.

Cogere notoriously introduces commands by the infinitive.

Cicero, by means of *gaudeo*, draws the distinction between the indicative and subjunctive with great clearness and beauty :—

Gaudeo quod bene *vales*,

the congratulation on his friend's *usual* good health.

On the other hand, when his friend had returned

from amid great dangers, safe and sound, he uses, not the indicative, but subjunctive :—

Gaudeo quod *redieris* incolumis.

Horace likewise uses the indicative to express a fact at which he does *not* wonder :—

Non hercule miror
Aiebat, si qui *comedunt* bona.

And Cicero uses the subjunctive to express a fact at which he *does* wonder :—

Mirabile videtur, quod non *rideat* haruspex, quum haruspicem viderit.

It is sufficiently notorious, even to tyros, that *postquam* is used in ordinary cases with the indicative. The employment of the subjunctive is therefore in itself extraordinary :—

Qui posteaquam maximas *aedificasset ornassetque* classes — legatos ac literas misit. — Cic., *P. Leg. Man.* 4.

Posteaquam illa, abducturam se filiam, mutaturam esse testamentum, *minaretur*, etc.—Id., *Pro Cluen.* 64.

These Ciceronian examples prove that extraordinary circumstances to be described account for the extraordinary employment of *postquam* with the subjunctive. In the first sentence, the superlative itself, *maximas*, indicates an extreme; in the second, the *threat* to change a will, indicates what is equally evil and extraordinary.

In none of the preceding cases is the difference between the indicative and subjunctive drawn with greater distinctness than in the following :—

Ceterum id quoque ad gloriam *accessit*, quod cum illo, simul justa ac legitima regna *occiderunt*.—*Livy*, i. 48.

The result here indicated by *accessit* was quite a secondary and subordinate one, and did not constitute at all the chief title-deed of Servius to fame. Very different is the result introduced by *accessit* with the subjunctive:—

Auguriis certe *tantus honos accessit*, ut nihil belli domique postea, nisi auspicato, *gereretur*.—*Id.* i. 36.

Here the complete subordination of the summoning of public assemblies and of armies to the college of soothsayers, constituted the college of soothsayers' peculiar prerogative, — an extraordinary union of honour and of power.

Let it not be supposed that only the word *ut* in Latin introduces a result, whether extraordinary or ordinary. It has already been seen that *quod* introduces an ordinary result. It will now be seen that extraordinary results, whether real or only imagined, can otherwise than by *ut* be expressed, but of course with the subjunctive:—

Irae altis urbibus ultimae
Stetere causae, *cur perirent*
Funditus.—*Hor.*

Si in sententia permaneres, magis *esset* pudendum. —Cic., *Tus.* ii. 14.

The opinion indicated in the conditional subjunctive clause must have been strange or wrong, since adherence to it is said in the consequent subjunctive

clause to be "shameful." The combinations by which an opinion strange or wrong is expressed are very various :—

Horum ea est sententia, ut virtus nil per se *valeat.* —*Tuscul.* v. 119.

Here the natural construction after *sententia* would be *virtutem valere ;* but Cicero, to give prominence to the strange and erroneous opinion, uses the subjunctive *valeat.* Another combination, descriptive of those who have strange or wrong opinions, is :—

Sunt qui *putent.*

Analogous to this is the origin of *reported speech* containing sentiments either strange or wrong, or at least such as the author is not responsible for : —

Socrates accusatus est quod *juventutem corrumperet.*

It is not the ordinary mode of narration.

As *ut* is not the only particle that introduces a result, so *quum* and *nisi* or *si* are not the only particles that introduce the cause, or what is of primary importance, *e.g.*,—

Ut desint vires tamen est laudanda voluntas.

—*Ovid.*

Here strength, whose presence is so much desired, whose absence is so much deplored, the primary and paramount consideration, is indicated by the subjunctive. On the other hand, will, which is secondary and subordinate, is described by the indicative.

It was seen above that an unemphatic clause, *e.g.*, *forte aderat,* to indicate an extraordinary coincidence, is expanded into Fors ita tulit *ut adesset,* and that the ordinary construction of *cogere* with the infinitive is

changed into cogitur ut se vita *privet.* In the two following examples a more striking change still takes place in connexion with the subjunctive:—

Se morituros quam ut tantum dedecoris *patiantur.* *Livy*, iv. 2.

Ante leves ergo pascentur in littore pisces
Quam nostro illius *labatur* pectore vultus.
—Vir., *Buc.* i. 60.

According to the rule of grammarians, "conjunctions couple like moods," the Latin should be—morituros quam passuros—pascentur quam labetur. The rule is most commonly observed, and hence a deviation from it is in itself exceptional and extraordinary. But the deviation only takes place when something exceptional is to be expressed. This coincidence, therefore, is only confirmatory of all that has been advanced in this treatise. The endurance of a plebeian as consul is repudiated as worse than a thousand deaths by the subjunctive (quam *patiantur*), the forgetting of a benefactor is repudiated as the last of improbabilities by means of the same mood (quam *labatur* pectore vultus).

There remains yet another argument to be adduced. It has been maintained throughout, at great length, that the subjunctive expresses what is exceptional or extraordinary. In proof of this, it is now remarked that that mood does not occur nearly so often as the indicative. In this respect, also, the latter is the ordinary mood, the former the extraordinary mood. If the subjunctive occurred more frequently than

the indicative, introducing what is extraordinary or exceptional, it would thereby cease to bear that characteristic, and become the ordinary mood. But the indicative occurs far more commonly, and is used unless there is some special reason for the subjunctive. That the indicative was understood by the Romans to mark what was ordinary, unemphatic, or incidental, is proved by the constant recurrence of these parenthetical clauses—(ut plerumque fit), (id quod saepe audivisti), (ut fieri solet), etc.

A passage from the close of the sixth book of the Æneid, a specimen, not a selection, may serve as an illustrative and demonstrative instance of the frequent occurrence of the indicative as contrasted with the subjunctive. From line 886 to 901, there are no fewer than seventeen instances of the indicative, while there are only two of the subjunctive.

The poet having exhausted the description of the shades below, the prime object of that book, in a succession of short, simple sentences, the indicative occurring in almost every line, subordinate to the main action of the poem, hurries his hero upward to the light of day:—

As in Greek, the very words expressing an extreme, *e.g.*, ἔσχατα, παρά, ὑπέρ, have been already seen united with the subjunctive, so is it in Latin:—

> *Prodigiosa* fides et Tuscis digna libellis,
> Quaeque coronata lustrari *debeat* agna.
>
> —*Juv.* xiii. 60.

Plato and Sophocles (see p. 17) agree in describing the aberration of madness by the subjunctive. Horace, no less remarkable for common sense, does the same:—

Ludere par impar, equitare in arundine longa
Si quem *delectet* barbatum, *amentia verset.*
—*Ser.* ii. 3, 248.

Cicero, too, who is commonly credited with ability to write Latin, does the same:—

O hominem *amentem*, qui ne umbram quidem veri *videret.*—*Att.* 7.

The following additional illustrative instance from Horace is equally strong and striking:—

Insani sapiens nomen *ferat*, aequus iniqui,
Ultra quam satis est, virtutem si *petat* ipsam.
—*Ep.* i. 6, 15.

In the next instance from Livy, *ultima* itself, like ἔσχατα (see p. 10) from Xenophon, is found with the subjunctive:—

Prius itaque, quam *ultima experirentur*, senatum iterum consulere placuit.—ii. 28.

One chapter in Book XXII. contains two confirmatory instances:—

Nullo loco, nisi quantum necessitas *cogeret*, fortunae se *commissurus.*

Castris, nisi quantum usus *necessario cogeret.*

After all that has been said, it is hardly necessary to remark, that the fact of a conception being contained in some of these sentences, has nothing whatever to do with the subjunctive. The single

ûsage of *ut*, introducing a result, is of itself fatal to that fancy, *e. g.*,—

Additus triumpho honos, *ut* statuae equestres eis, *rara* illa aetate res, in foro *ponerentur*.—*Livy*, viii. 13.

The little word *rara* is significant here. It is found in this same book, and, as might have been expected, with the subjunctive:—

Raros, quibus ferrum in manu *sit invenies*.—38.

The great principle to be evolved from a consideration of these collected instances, is that the syntax requires to be subordinate to the sense. It has been seen, in case after case, that the ordinary rules of grammarians have been suspended when the sense of the sentence required it. Just as in politics, the safety of the state is the first and highest consideration, the supreme law to which all others give way, so is it in Latin philology. Another deduction to be drawn from this principle is, that it is the function of language, when allowed to be its own interpreter, to give laws to grammar, and not grammar to give laws to language.

It now only remains to present a summary of the various combinations introducing the subjunctive. So many solitary usages of the subjunctive would of themselves prove nothing as to its true nature. The reader, therefore, has to be reminded that each is only a specimen of a regularly recurring formula common to all the Roman classic writers, to be found in almost every page of their works. Such combinations in themselves have no power to produce

the subjunctive, but are subordinate to the supreme law—the adequate expression of the sense. So many forms of expression, apparently remote from, but really related to, each other, converging to a common centre, point only to one conclusion, that this uniformity of result could only have arisen from, and can only be accounted for by, uniformity of design. While the first sixteen formulæ introduce a fact by the subjunctive without condition, qualification, or reserve, and five of these are entirely independent of "dependence," all alike possess the common element of what is exceptional or extraordinary, or that to which extreme importance is attached, and to which prominence is to be given :—

UNCONDITIONAL, ABSOLUTE, FACT, INTRODUCED BY THE SUBJUNCTIVE.

I. Sunt qui *censeant* una animum et corpus occidere. —Cic., *Tusc.* i. 9.

"Indefiniteness" is a mere accident, not an essential property, as these prove :—

Una est quae *reparet* seque ipsa *reseminet* ales,
Assyrii Phoenica vocant.—Ovid, *Met.* xv. 319.

Soli *centum* erant, qui creari patres *possent.*—*Livy*, i. 8.

Inventus est scriba *quidam* Cn. Flavius qui cornicum oculos *confixerit.*—Cic., *P. Mur.* xi.

II. Caninius fuit *mirifica* vigilantia, qui suo toto consulatu somnum non *viderit.*—*Cic.*

III. *Mirum quantum* illi viro nuntianti haec fidei *fuerit*.—*Livy*, i. 16.

IV. Campani majora deliquerant, quam quibus ignosci posset.—*Id.*

V *Irae* altis urbibus ultimae
Stetere causae, cur *perirent*
Funditus.—*Hor.* c. i. 16.

VI. Trepidationis aliquantum edebant, *donec* quietem ipse timor *fecisset*.—*Livy*, xxi. 28.

VII. Exercitus *prius* vicit, *quam* se sine duce pugnare *sentiret*.—*Livy*, iii. 18.

VIII. *Excepto* quod non simul *esses*, caetera laetus. —*Hor.*

IX. *Tantus* timor omnem exercitum occupavit, ut *non mediocriter* omnium mentes *perturbaret*.—Cæs., *B. G.* i. 39.

The apparent contradiction of *tantum*, "so great" and "so little," *i.e.*, "only," finds its explanation in the subjunctive. Each is only the extreme of an ordinary standard. In the following example from the same authority, the extreme of smallness is seen in a manner not to be mistaken :—

Praesidii *tantum* est, ut ne murus quidem cingi *possit*.—*Id.* vi. 35.

Two other extremes, a good greatly to be desired, and an evil greatly to be dreaded, are illustrated by the subjunctive :—

X. Quod nunquam opinatus fui, id contigit, *ut* salvi *potiremur* domum.

Accidit *ut* una nocte omnes Hermae statuae *dejicerentur*.—Nep., *Alc.* 3.

XI. Tragoedi quotidie *antequam pronuncient*, vocem sensim excitant.—Cic., *Or.* i. 59.

The preceding *formulae* illustrate the prominence given to the *effect*. The five following illustrate the prominence given to the *cause*, or primary consideration :—

FACT INDEPENDENT OF "DEPENDENCE."

XII. Quod omnino biduum supererat, *quum* exercitui frumentum metiri *oporteret*, rei frumentariae prospiciendum existimavit. (*Quum oporteret*, most definite).—Cæs., *B. G.* i. 23.

XIII. Alexander, *quum* Clitum *familiarem* suum *interemisset*, manus a se vix abstinuit.—Cic., *Tusc.* iv. 37.

XIV. Qui, *posteaquam* maximas *aedificasset ornassetque* classes, legatos missit.—Cic., *P. Leg. M.* 4.

XV. Phocion, *quum* ditissimus esse *posset*, fuit perpetuo pauper.—Nep., *Phoc.* 1.

XVI. Ut vires *desint* tamen, est laudanda voluntas. —*Ovid.*

SUBJUNCTIVE STILL INDEPENDENT.

XVII. *Antequam* tibi ex possessionibus tuis tantum *reficiatur*, ut eo tueri legionem possis, nunquam eris dives.—Cic., *Par.* vi. i.

XVIII. *Nisi* memoriam *exerceas*, minuitur.—Cic., *de Sen.* 7.

XIX. Quis *tulerit* Gracchos de seditione querentes. —*Juv.* ii. 24.

XX. *Eloquar* an *sileam.*—Virgil, *Æn.* iii. 39.

XXI. M. Egone *ut* te *interpellem?*—C., *Tusc.* ii. 18.

XXII. Quicquid erat Patrum, reos *diceres.*—*Livy*, ii. 35.

XXIII. *Ut* ita *dicam.* Passim. (Formula to soften something strange or striking.)—*Id.*

XXIV. Prope *dixerim.*—*Id.*

XXV. Si *dignum* crearitis, *qui* secundus ab Romulo *numeretur.*—*Livy*, i. 17.

XXVI. Aristides nonne ob eam causam expulsus est patria, quod *praeter modum* justus esset.—Cic., *Tusc.*

XXVII. O mihi praeteritos *referat* si Jupiter annos. —*Virgil.* (Boon greatly to be desired.)

XXVIII. *Plenior* ut *si* quos *delectet* copia *justo*,

Cum ripa simul avulsos ferat Aufidus acer.

—*Hor.* lib. i. sat. i. 57.

(Bane greatly to be dreaded).

XXIX. *Quasi* tuta omnia mi *forent.*—*Catul.* xxx. 8. (Which is greatly to be desired.)

XXX. *Quasi* res dubia aut obscura *sit.*—Cic., *Div. in Cæc.* 4. (Which is greatly to be dreaded.)

XXXI. Te *teneam* moriens deficiente manu.—*Tibul.*

XXXII. *Utinamque* oculos in pectora *posses*

Inserere.—Ovid, *Met.*

XXXIII. *Ne* se sanguine nefando soceri generique *respergerent.*—*Livy*, i. 12. (An evil greatly to be dreaded.)

XXXIV. Ante leves ergo pascentur in aethere cervi
Quam nostro illius *labatur* pectore vultus.
Vir., *E.* i. 64.

(An evil greatly to be dreaded.)

XXXV. Non sum is, qui nubeculam tuae frontis *timeam.*—Cic., *In Pis.*

XXXVI. Quae latebra est, in quam non *intret* metus mortis?—*Senec.*

XXXVII. Platonem existimo, *si* genus forense dicendi tractare *voluisset*, gravissime dicere potuisse.—Cic., *Off.* i. 1. (It is not usual for great thinkers to attempt to become also great speakers.)

XXXVIII. Memoria erat tanta, ut, quae secum *commentatus esset*, ea sine scripto verbis eisdem *redderet*, quibus *cogitavisset.*—Cic., *Brut.* 88.

Such is the subjunctive as derived from the ancient Greeks, and developed by the Romans.

Jamque opere exacto, the writer only appends the pointed words of the practical Horace:—

Si quid novisti rectius istis
Candidus imperti; si non his utere mecum.

APPENDIX.

THE GREEK NEGATIVE Μή.

The German Kühner, already introduced in the preceding pages, has written, and had circulated far and wide in England, these words :—

"οὐ conveys an independent and immediate negation,—he is *not* good : μή, a negation depending on a supposition,—*I do not think* that he is good."

There can be no mistake as to the meaning through translation, for Dr Schmitz, himself a German, has written :—

"οὐ expresses an *objective* or absolute negation, while μή expresses only a *subjective* or relative negation. This negative is added to a participle or infinitive, because they are mostly = a conditional clause with εἰ."—*Greek Gram.*, p. 155.

Or, in other words :—

"οὐ and μή differ from each other, as do the indicative and subjunctive moods; οὐ belonging to the mood of fact, μή to the mood of conception."

This opinion has been adopted by the late lamented Donaldson :—

"Τὸ μὴ γενέσθαι is 'the supposition that it has not come to pass.' Participle μὴ δρῶν, 'if he abstains from doing.' Οὐ is used after relatives when the antecedent is definite, because in this case there is an affirmation; but μή follows the relative when the antecedent is indefinite, because in this case there is an hypothesis. Thus ὅς μὴ ποιεῖ ταῦτα = ὁ μὴ ποιῶν ταῦτα = si quis non haec facit."—*Gr. Gram.*, p. 213.

The Oxford lexicographers have adopted the same opinion:—

"Μή expresses subjectively that *one thinks* that a thing is *not*; οὐ, objectively that it is *not*.—Μή, *Lid. and Scott.*

This theory is to be subjected here to the same treatment as those dealt with in detail above. It is to be tested by its fruits. It makes sad havoc of more than half of Grecian history when applied. As fact, and not fancy, is concerned here, Herodotus, the father of history, is the first witness called into court:—

"ὦ ξεῖνε Ἀθηναῖε, ἡ δὲ ἡμετέρη εὐδαιμονίη οὕτω τοι ἐς τὸ μηδὲν ἀπέρριπται."—*Clio*, 32.

Whatever is said of μή, of course applies to μηδέν. The Germans say that μηδέν "is the Greek word for nothing, because it expresses mere nonentity, a conception of the mind."

In the name of common sense, not in the transcendental sense, it is here asked, how the prosperity of a king could be lowered into a "nonentity, a con-

ception of the mind"? The point is too ludicrous for grave discussion.

Another passage in Herodotus precisely parallel to this excites the same feelings, and points to the same conclusion :—

ἐξάρας γάρ με ὑψοῦ, ἐς τὸ μηδὲν κατέβαλες.—*Cal.* 79.

The poor wretches, at least, who were thus the sport of fortune, felt that the place to which they were cast down was no "nonentity, a conception of the mind," but a terrible reality.

A passage from Sophocles shows the converse process, elevation from a low to a lofty condition :—

ἤδη τὸ μηδὲν ὄντας, ἐν τροπῇ δοξός,
ἐῤῥύσατ' ἐλθὼν μοῦνος.—*Ajax*, 1275

According to another German theory, "indefinite frequency," the Greeks were in the habit of taking Troy from "time to time;" therefore, according to this theory, the Greeks, though "a mere nonentity, a conception of the mind," were "in the habit of taking Troy from time to time." The one theory is in every way worthy of the other.

One other passage, from the Father of History, with μηδέν must be cited :—

φοιτεόντων τῶν Σκυθέων ἐπ' ἄγρην, καὶ ἀεὶ φερόντων, καί κοτε συνήνεικε ἐλεῖν σφεας μηδέν.—*Clio*, 73.

According to the German theory, the Scythian sailors succeeded here in catching a "mere nonentity, a conception of the mind."

The explanation of all these passages will be

given in connexion with the following from the same authority:—

Μηδένα εἶναι τῶν ζωόντων ὄλβιον.—*Id.* 86.

This celebrated statement of Solon, with *μή*, introduces a fact, *objectively* or absolutely, without condition, qualification, or reserve, but with this peculiarity, one to be *deplored.* This is the legitimate and logical inference from *μή* prohibitive. In the following citations this interpretation is not left to be inferred, but expressly stated in so many words:—

ἤκουσα τὸ μήτε ἰδεῖν ὄφελον.—*Id.* 3.

εἶδον ὄψιν ἐν τῷ ὕπνῳ, τὴν μηδαμὰ ὄφελον ἰδεῖν.—*Id.* iii. 65.

δῶρον, ὃ μή ποτ' ἐγὼ ταλακάρδιος
ἐπωφέλησα πόλεος ἐξελέσθαι.—*Œd. Col.* 540.

There is a passage in Euripides which brings out still more clearly and conclusively the fundamental and essential property of *μή*:—

Εἴθ' ὤφελ' Ἀργοῦς μὴ διαπτάσθαι σκάφος
Κόλχων ἐς αἶαν κυανέας Συμπληγάδας,
μηδ' ἐν νάπαισι Πηλίου πεσεῖν ποτε
τμηθεῖσα πεύκη, μηδ' ἐρετμῶσαι χέρας.—*Medea,* 1.

Here, in these successive lines, *μή* introduces a past act *absolutely*, with, of course, the accompanying peculiarity, that it is greatly to be *deplored.* Euripides, too, furnishes a case of *μηδέν*, which completely coincides in every circumstance with those of his countrymen cited above:—

ὦ πλεῖστ' ἔχων κάλλιστά τ' εὐτεκνώτατε

Πρίαμε, γεραιά θ' ἡδ' ἐγὼ μήτηρ τέκνων,
ὡς ἐς τὸ μηδὲν ἥκομεν, φρονήματος
τοῦ πρὶν στερέντες.—*Hec.* 622.

Here Hecuba bewails her present deplorable position, as contrasted with her previous one.

The same property of μή with a participle is equally certain and conspicuous :—

τούτου δὲ μηκέτι ἐόντος.—*Herod.* iii. 65.

The meaning of this is not what the late lamented Dr Donaldson represents it, and Dr Schmitz, the representative of the Germans, "Si quis non jam sit," but Quum hicce non jam sit.

This is neither "hypothesis nor indefiniteness," but Cambyses *deplores* the past death of his brother Smerdis, who ought to have been living, for he was murdered. This is the legitimate and logical interpretation of the words. In proof whereof, let Herodotus himself be heard :—

ἀνοσίῳ μόρῳ τετελεύτηκεν ὕπο τῶν ἑωυτοῦ.

Xenophon, who, also like Herodotus, wrote history, employed μή for that purpose :—

τὸ ἐκείνου μεμνῆσθαι μὴ παρόντος οὐ μικρὰ ὠφέλει.—*Mem.* iv. 1.

The words μὴ παρόντος do not mean "si quis non adsit," but *quum Socrates non adsit.* Socrates *actually, absolutely,* was no longer present. Socrates deserved to live. His friends desired him to live. His death, a past historical act, not an "indefinite" hypothesis, was greatly *deplored,* and as an act of judicial murder denounced.

Case after case follows from Xenophon, confirming what goes before :—

Σὺ μὲν τοίνυν, ὦ Τιγράνη, ἔφη, ἀπάγου τὴν σὴν γυναῖκα· οὐδὲ γὰρ εἰλῆφθαι ἔγωγε αἰχμάλωτον νομίζω, σοῦ γε μὴ πώποτε φυγόντος ἡμᾶς.—*Cyr.* iii. 1, 7.

In μὴ φυγόντος the notion of "indefiniteness" or an "hypothesis" is entirely excluded. These words introduce the absolute statement of a definite fact belonging to the past.

In the two preceding cases, Xenophon specifies Socrates and Tigranes by μή. In the following he applies it to himself. If the Germans regard a man speaking of himself, as making an indefinite reference, what do they regard as a definite reference ?—

Ἀχαιοὶ ἔλεγον ὡς δεινὸν εἴη ἰδία μὲν Ξενοφῶντα θύεσθαι ὑπὲρ τῆς μονῆς μὴ κοινούμενον τῇ στρατιᾷ.—*Anab.* v. 6, 27.

Let it not be imagined for a moment that μὴ κοινούμενον means "if he should not communicate." The words refer to a past act. It is written a few paragraphs before (16)—ἐθύετο πρίν τινι εἰπεῖν. The words, of course, imply that something was which ought not to have been. If proof were necessary, the written word δεινόν would supply it.

To the testimony of Xenophon is to be added that of Thucydides :—

γνῶτε ἀναγκαῖον ὂν ὑμῖν ἀνδράσιν ἀγαθοῖς γίγνεσθαι, ὡς μὴ ὄντος χωρίου ἐγγὺς, ὅποι ἂν σωθείητε.—vii. 77.

The words μὴ ὄντος χωρίου do not mean, according to the Germans, Dr Donaldson, and the Oxford lexico-

graphers, "if there be not a retreat," but "*since there is not a retreat.*" Two other citations are to be made from the second book :—

προϊδόντες γὰρ οἱ Θηβαῖοι ὅτι ἔσοιτο ὁ πόλεμος, ἠβούλοντο τὴν Πλάταιαν ἀεὶ σφίσι διάφορον οὖσαν ἔτι ἐν εἰρήνῃ τε καὶ τοῦ πολέμου μήπω φανεροῦ καθεστῶτος, προκαταλαβεῖν.—ii. 2.

Here the reference in *μήπω* is to the Peloponnesian war itself. It is impossible to conceive any reference more *definite* than that. This being the case, it is scarcely necessary to say that the existence of the Peloponnesian war cannot involve "an hypothesis." There is no need of argument here. The theory only requires to be placed beside such sentences, and it refutes itself. The other citation referred to is :—

διὰ τὸ μὴ κτώμενος ἐξ οὐ προσηκόντων τὴν δύναμιν πρὸς ἡδονήν τι λέγειν.—*Id.* 65.

A reference to Pericles, prime minister of Athens, could scarcely be called "indefinite," and surely his existence does not involve "an hypothesis." Surely even the Germans, with all their strange and strong liking for *myths*, would not resolve Pericles into a "myth."

Another instance of *μή* with a participle introducing a past historical act *definitely* and absolutely, must be given from the Father of History :—

ὁμήρους τε τῶν παραμεινάντων Ἀθηναίων καὶ μὴ αὐτίκα φυγόντων παῖδας λαβών.—*Clio*, 63.

The difficulty of resolving the Athenians themselves into a "myth" will still be greater.

Such usages of μή have hitherto been supposed to be common to Plutarch, Lucian, etc., and thorough-going theorists got out by alleging that these writers wrote "bad Greek." From the proofs cited above, and those cited below, it will be seen that the usage was common to all the Greeks. The usage is extremely common in the logical Sophocles:—

πάλαι δὲ μὴ παρὼν θαυμάζεται.—*Œd. Rex.*
ὁ μηδὲν εἰδὼς Οἰδίπους, ἔπαυσά νιν.—*Id.* 397.
ὅτῳ γ' ὁρῶντι μηδὲν ἦν ἰδεῖν γλυκύ;—*Id.* 1335.
καὶ τίς πρὸς ἀνδρὸς μὴ βλέποντος ἄρκεσις;—*Col.* 73.

These four references are made directly to Œdipus himself, and the next four also:—

ἀλλ', οἶδα γάρ σε ταῦτα μὴ πείθων, ἴθι.—*Id.* 797.
ἐς χεῖρας ἦλθον πατρί, καὶ κατέκτανον,
μηδὲν ξυνιεὶς ὧν ἔδρων.—*Id.* 976.
ὡς μὴ εἰδότ' αὐτὸν μηδὲν ὧν σὺ πυνθάνει.—*Id.* 1155.
ὅτῳ μήτ' Ἄρης,
μήτε πόντος ἀντέκυρσεν.—*Id.* 1680.
ἐπίσταμαι γὰρ τήνδε τὴν ἐς τάσδε μοι
τέρψιν παρ' ἄλλου μηδενὸς πεφασμένην.—*Id.* 1122.

Three additional illustrative instances may be given from the *Philoctetes*, which, coinciding completely with those relative to Œdipus, confirm them, and conduct the student to the same conclusion. Μή introduces a fact definitely and absolutely, but of course one not deserved or desired, and therefore to be deplored:—

οἰκτείρω νιν ἔγωγ', ὅπως,
μή του κηδομένου βροτῶν,
μηδὲ ξύντροφον ὄμμ' ἔχων,

δύστανος μόνος αἰεί,
νοσεῖ μὲν νόσον ἀγρίαν.—170.
ὦ μελέα ψυχά,
ὃς μηδ' οἰνοχύτου πώματος ἥσθη δεκέτη χρόνον.
—*Id.* 715.

In the next, the hero of the play, addressing Ulysses, says:—

ὦ μηδὲν ὑγιὲς μηδ' ἐλεύθερον φρονῶν
οἷός μ' ὑπῆλθες.—*Id.* 1006.

In every one of the following additional examples, μή with a participle introduces a fact definitely and absolutely. The opposite interpretation is a simple impossibility:—

οὐδ' ὡς μίασμα τοῦτο μὴ τρέσας, ἐγὼ
θάπτειν παρήσω κεῖνον.—*Antig.* 1042.
ἀλλ' εὖγέ τοι κάτισθι μὴ πολλοὺς ἔτ'
τροχοὺς ἁμιλλητῆρας Ἡλίου τελῶν,
ἐν οἷσι τῶν σῶν αὐτὸς ἐκ σπλάγχνων ἕνα
νέκυν νεκρῶν ἀμοιβὸν ἀντιδοὺς ἔσει.—*Id.* 1067.
γέροντι δηλώσω πατρί,
μή τοι φύσιν γ' ἄσπλαγχνος ἐκ κείνου γεγώς.
—*Ajax*, 472.
σοὶ δὲ συγγνώμη λέγειν
τάδ' ἐστί, μὴ πάσχουσαν ὡς ἐγὼ κακῶς.
—Eurip., *Med.* 815.
εὕρημα γάρ τοι μὴ φιλοψυχοῦσ' ἐγὼ
κάλλιστον ηὗρηκ', εὐκλεῶς λιπεῖν βίον.
—Id., *Herac.* 533.
νῦν χαῖρε μὲν χθών, χαῖρε δ' ἡλίου φάος,
ὕπατός τε χώρας Ζεύς, ὁ Πύθιός τ' ἄναξ,
τόξοις ἰάπτων μηκέτ' εἰς ἡμᾶς βέλη.—Æs., *Ag.* 510.

Demosthenes and Æschines, though later, wrote like their predecessors :—

τὸ δὲ μὴ προσγράψαντα "ἐπειδὰν τὰς εὐθύνας δῷ" στέφανον κελεῦσαι., *i.e.*, but the question as to him who, having recommended my coronation, *failed* to append this clause,—"when he shall have given in his account," etc.—*De Cor.* 23.

The person here referred to is not an indefinite, imaginary individual, but a historical personage. It is Ctesiphon himself, the defendant in this trial. Æschines, the antagonist of Demosthenes, has written :—

Ὁ ῥήτωρ γέγραφε τὸν ὑπεύθυνον στεφανοῦν, μὴ προσθεὶς ἐπειδὰν δῷ λόγον καὶ εὐθύνας.—*Con. Ctes.* 58, § 31.

Only one citation will be made from Plutarch, in which there is a coincidence with the writer of the ΥΠΟΘΕΣΙΣ prefixed to the *Prometheus*,—not only as to syntax and sense, but even to the very words :—

καὶ μὴ βουλόμενον ὀργισθεὶς ἀνελεῖν προσέταξεν.—*Alex.*

καὶ μὴ βουλόμενον βροντὴ καταῤῥαγεῖσα αὐτὸν ἀφανίζει. *Prom. Hyp.*

In each case μή introduces a fact, definite and absolute, but of course what ought not to have been. Therein these writers wrote like those cited above.

A few cases must be cited here containing the relative with μή, which are quite inconsistent with Dr Donaldson's statement :—

"Μή follows the relative when the antecedent is

indefinite, because in this case there is an hypothesis." *Gr. Gr.*, p. 214.

τίς τοῦδε γ' ἀνδρός ἐστιν ἀθλιώτερος ;
ὃν μὴ ἔξεστι μήτ' ἀστῶν τινὰ
δόμοις δέχεσθαι, μηδὲ προσφωνεῖν τινά,
ὠθεῖν ἀπ' οἴκων.—*Œd. Rex.* 815.

Phil. ὦ πόλλ' ἐγὼ μοχθηρός, ὦ πικρὸς θεοῖς,
οὗ μηδὲ κληδὼν ὧδ' ἔχοντος οἰκάδε,
μηδ' Ἑλλάδος γῆς μηδαμοῦ διῆλθέ που.
—*Phil.* 255.

τοῖσι, *i.e.*, οἷς γὰρ μήτε ἄστεα ἢ ἐκτισμένα, κῶς οὐκ ἂν εἴησαν οὗτοι ἄμαχοι.—Herod., *Melp.* 46.

The reference is most definite, τῷ Σκυθικῷ γένει.—*Id.*

Of course, μή is found with indefinite references, but as almost endless examples of it with the most definite references have been given above, definiteness or indefiniteness, as in the case of the Latin or Greek subjunctive, is a mere accident. The essential property, the characteristic common to both usages, some unhappy state of the persons referred to, *e.g.*,—

οὓς δὲ μὴ εὕρισκον (left unburied), νεκοτάφιον αὐτοῖς ἐποίησαν.—*Anab.* vi. 4, 9.

καὶ ἐπνίγετο ὅστις νεῖν μὴ ἐτύγχανεν ἐπιστάμενος.—*Id.* v. 7, 25.

ὅσοι μὴ εἰς τὴν θάλατταν κατέφυγον κατελεύσθησαν.—*Id.* 2.

οἱ μὴ δυνάμενοι διατελέσαι τὴν ὁδὸν ἐνυκτέρευσαν ἄσιτοι. *Id.* iv. 5, 11.

The further declaration of the same great scholar and thinker must be considered :—

Τὸ *μὴ γενέσθαι* is "the supposition that it has not come to pass."

This modern dogma is constantly contradicted by the common practice of all the ancient Greeks, and hence cannot be correct. Indeed, this interpretation of the combination in the following passages is a sheer impossibility, and would falsify history:—

Ἀνὴρ *κατελείπετο διὰ τὸ μηκέτι δύνασθαι πορεύεσθαι.* —*Anab.* v. 8, 8.

λείπομαι γὰρ ἐν
τὸ μὴ δύνασθαι μήθ' ὁρᾶν, δυοῖν κακοῖν.
—*Œd. Col.* 496.

εὖ γὰρ τόδ' ἴσθι, μηδάμ' ἡμέρᾳ μιᾷ
πλῆθος τοσουτάριθμον ἀνθρώπων θανεῖν.
—*Persæ*, 431.

εὖ νῦν τόδ' ἴσθι μηδέπω μεσοῦν κακόν.—*Id.* 435.

The testimony of these three most competent witnesses is confirmed and crowned by the testimony of their great compatriot, Thucydides. The historian, by *τὸ μὴ βοηθῆσαι*, describes facts known to the whole world, which the application of this modern dogma would convert into a myth:—

ἡ εὐεργεσία ἐς Σαμίους, τὸ δι' ἡμᾶς Πελοποννησίους αὐτοῖς μὴ βοηθῆσαι, παρέσχεν ὑμῖν ἐπικράτησιν Σαμίων.—i. 41.

Περικλῆς *πιστεύων ὀρθῶς γιγνώσκειν περὶ τοῦ μὴ ἐπεξιέναι, ἐκκλησίαν οὐκ ἐποίει.*—ii. 21.

τοῦ μὴ ἐπεξιέναι refers to a past specific historical act, for in the preceding chapter it is stated *ὅτι στρατηγὸς ὢν οὐκ ἐπεξάγοι.*

A notion germane to those already dealt with

in detail has been propounded by the Oxford lexicographers:—

"Μή is used after the final conjunctions ἵνα, ὡς, ὅπως, ὥστε, because these are in their nature *contingent*.—*Article* Μή.

The usual test must be applied to this doctrine in connexion with ὥστε:—

Τῶν δὲ Πλαταιῶν τις τὰς πύλας ἔκλῃσε στυρακίῳ ἀκοντίου ἀντὶ βαλάνου χρησάμενος ἐς τὸν μοχλόν, ὥστε μηδὲ ταύτῃ ἔτι ἔξοδον εἶναι.—*Thuc.* ii. 4.

ὥστε with μηδέ here introduces the statement of a fact without condition, qualification, reserve, or "contingency." This is still more clear when the statement is made in the language of Livy:—

Quidam portas ita clausit, *ut* ne hac quidem jam exitus *pateret*.

The state of these Thebans was of course, as implied by μή, deplorable enough—a bolted door before, an infuriated foe behind. Such sentences are found in shoals in Thucydides. Only one other will be given from the celebrated description of the plague:—

τὰ δὲ ἐντὸς οὕτως ἐκάετο ὥστε μήτε τῶν πάνυ λεπτῶν ἱματίων ἐπιβολὰς ἀνέχεσθαι.—ii. 49.

What state could be more deplorable than this? and what statement could be made more absolutely? ὥστε μήτε ἀνέχεσθαι = *ut neque sustinerent*. It is a complete confusion of thought and perversion of language to say that ὥστε is "contingent." It is *consequent*, not "contingent." The difference be-

tween ὥστε οὐ and ὥστε μή is well illustrated by Xenophon :—

καὶ τὰ ἐπιτήδεια ἐν τούτοις ἀνακεκομισμένοι ἦσαν ὥστε μηδὲν λαμβάνειν αὐτόθεν τοὺς Ἕλληνας. — *An.* iv. 7, 17.

The Greeks, when the source of their supplies was stopped, were in a rather deplorable state. On the other hand, the description made by οὐ, is a result not deplorable :—

ὥστε βασιλεὺς οὐδὲν ἤχθετο αὐτῶν πολεμούντων. — *Id.* i. 1, 8.

A partial observer might here found a fanciful theory "that οὐ is used in *contingent* propositions." The source of the supposition that the essential property of μή is "indefiniteness, or an hypothesis, or contingency," is to be traced to the single usage of εἰ μή. But εἰ οὐ is also found in the best authors :—

Κῦρος δ' εἶπεν οὐκ ἄρα ἔτι μαχεῖται, εἰ ἐν ταύταις οὐ μαχεῖται ταῖς ἡμέραις.—*An.* i. 7, 18.

Εἰ δέ τοι οὐ δώσει ἐὸν ἄγγελον εὐρύοπα Ζεύς. — *Il.* xxiv. 298.

εἰ δ' ἀποστῆναι Ἀθηναίων οὐκ ἠθελήσαμεν, οὐκ ἀδικοῦμεν. —*Thuc.* iii. 55.

It is clear, therefore, that the expression of an hypothesis is not peculiar to μή. It is only an occasional and accidental adjunct. In none of the numerous combinations of μή, is its essential property more certain or conspicuous than with εἰ. It thereby very often introduces the contemplated

non-fulfilment of a necessary or desirable condition, which is, of course, to be deplored :—

ἐχώρουν πρὸς τὴν πόλιν, ὅπως, εἰ μὴ λόγοις πείθοιεν, ἔργῳ πειρῶντο τοῦ τείχους.—*Thuc.* ii. 81.

χεἰ μή τις ἀρχῆς τῆς ἐμῆς ἀκούσεται
ψῆφος κατ' αὐτῶν ὀλεθρία βουλεύσεται.
—Επ. Επ. Θηβ. 191.

εἰ δὲ μή τι πρὸς καιρὸν λέγων
κυρῶ, πέπαυμαι.—*Philoc.* 1280.

When εἰ μή introduces a second alternative, it is the one to be deplored :—

προεῖπον τοὺς ξένους ἀπαθεῖς ἀπιέναι, εἰ δὲ μή, ὡς πολεμίους χρήσεσθαι.—*Thuc.* i. 26.

πρὶν μάθοιμ', εἰ καὶ πάλιν
γνώμην μετοίσεις· εἰ δὲ μή, θάνοις κακῶς.
—*Philoc.* 962.

λέγει ὅτι ἄξει αὐτοὺς ὅθεν ὄψονται θάλασσαν.
εἰ δὲ μή, τεθνάναι ἐπηγγείλατο.—*An.* iv. 7, 20.

So *passim* μάλιστα μέν, "what is best of all," and εἰ δὲ μή, "what is worse."

Thus μή, even as a negative, has been seen to be incompatible with an "hypothesis," and when found with εἰ to be independent of it; and οὐ has been found with εἰ; hence it follows that the presence or absence of an hypothesis has nothing to do with the difference between οὐ and μή. It has also been seen what is the difference between ὥστε μή and ὥστε οὐ. The same distinction comes out equally certain and conspicuous when these particles are used interrogatively. The answer "*yes*" is anticipated by

οὐ, as right and natural; whereas the answer "*no*," is anticipated by μή, because an act of nonconformity is conceived and condemned :—

ὦ δεινὰ λέξασ', οὐχὶ συγκλήσεις στόμα,
καὶ μὴ μεθήσεις αὖθις αἰσχίστους λόγους ;—*Hip.* 449.
οὐ σῖγ' ἀνέξει, μηδὲ δειλίαν ἀρεῖς.—*Ajax*, 75.

It is the same with μῶν = μὴ οὖν :—

μῶν τί μοι μέγα
πάρεστε πρὸς κακοῖσι πέμποντες κακόν.—*Phil.* 1265.
οἵ μοι, τί φῄς, ὦ ἄνθρωπε ; μῶν ὀλώλαμεν ;—*Ajax*, 791.

With equal clearness and certainty does μή in the two next combinations contrast and condemn what is wrong :—

εἴτε ὀρθῶς ἐγὼ λογίζομαι, εἴτε καὶ μή.—*Dem. de Rhod.*, lib. 193.

πρῶτον μὲν διεδικάσαντο οἱ τὲ καλῶς και ὁσίως βιώσαντες, καὶ οἱ μή.—*Phædo*, 113, D.

Before showing the difference between μή and οὐ, as determined by the practice of the Greeks, the deliverance of Professor Madvig of Copenhagen on this subject falls to be considered. This widely-known writer says, in his *Greek Syntax*, that Plutarch, Arrian, and Lucian use μή instead of οὐ, a practice due to the *usus ethicus*. Had he said no more, it would have been difficult to dispose of the "mystic phrase." He has, however, vouchsafed the explanation that "μή is a milder form of negation." This distinction is not only not correct, but exactly contrary to what is correct. In the name of reason, it is here asked how "μή can be milder than οὐ, since μή is = to οὐ and μή together, *e.g.*,

μὴ κλέπτε is = οὐ μὴ κλέψεις. According to Professor Madvig's logic, the whole is less than one of its parts. But this is not all. Οὐ and μή are used in the same sentence where the negation rises in intensity with μή :—

μὴ ὅπως ὀρχεῖσθαι ἐν ῥυθμῷ, ἀλλ' οὐδ' ὀρθοῦσθαι ἐδύνασθε. —Xen., *Cyr.* i. 3, 10.

These individuals were not able to stand upright, hence far more were they not able to dance.

ἃ καὶ λόγῳ ἐστὶν ἀκούειν οὐκ ἐπιτρεπές, μὴ ὅτι δὴ ἔργῳ. Plato, *Phædo*, 240.

What is not pleasant to hear, must, to a far greater extent, be not pleasant to do.

Thus the definite, direct, absolute statement of a fact being common to μή and οὐ, it follows that their difference is one of degree, and not of nature; and μή, being the stronger of the two, is naturally used as a prohibitive. A single passage from Sophocles presents the three different forms of prohibition by μή :—

Menelaus. προφωνῶ τόνδε μὴ θάπτειν, ὅπως
μὴ τόνδε θάπτων αὐτὸς ἐς ταφὰς πέσῃς.
Chorus. Μενέλαε, μὴ γνώμας ὑποστήσας σοφάς,
εἶτ' αὐτὸς ἐν θανοῦσιν ὑβριστὴς γένῃ.
—*Ajax*, 1088.

Μή here forbids or deprecates certain things, because they are bad or base. This is the legitimate and logical deduction to be drawn from the different clauses of this comprehensive passage. But the Greeks often with μή say so, in so many words :—

ΜΗ ΜΕΝΤΟΙ ΓΕ, ΜΗ ΣΠΑΝΙΖΑΣ ΓΕ, ΑΛΛΩΣ ΑΝΟΙΞΗΙ. ΟΥ ΓΑΡ ΑΜΕΙΝΟΝ.—*Her.* i. 187.

κακὸν τὸ μὴ 'χειν.—Phœn. 405.

μεῖζον γὰρ ἢ σοῦ μὴ τυχεῖν τί μοι κακόν;—Hip. 327.

Here the German theory, as enunciated and expounded by their countryman, Dr Schmitz, in this country, must be quoted :—

"*οὐκ ἔχω*, I have not, absolutely; *μὴ ἔχω*, I think I have not,—it is my subjective and personal opinion that I have not."—*Gr. Gr.*, pp. 155, 156.

Many consider this distinction of "subjective and objective" a stroke of genius, and praise the syntax of Kühner as "philosophical." The writer prefers giving his opinion of it in words other than his own. It is thus that the Regius Professor of Greek at Cambridge writes to him :—

"The grammarians here try to help us with their *nostrum* of 'subjective and objective,' but to little purpose. Here a theory is really wanted."

To the theory of the modern Germans the author has opposed the theory of the ancient Greeks themselves, as ascertained from their common and consistent practice. No ancient Greek has treated this modern "nostrum" of "subjective and objective" more fairly, but at the same time more mercilessly, than Sophocles. Philoctetes, an outcast in the lonely isle of Lemnos, *knew* and *felt* himself, *μὴ ἔχων*, actually and absolutely :—

ὦ πόλλ' ἐγὼ μοχθηρός, ὦ πικρὸς θεοῖς

οὔ μηδὲ κληδὼν ὧδ' ἔχοντος οἴκαδε
μηδ' Ἑλλάδος γῆς μηδαμοῦ διῆλθέ που.—256.

It was *not* "his personal, subjective opinion," but the absolute objective conviction of others:—

Chorus. οἰκτείρω νιν ἔγωγ' ὅπως
μή του κηδομένου βροτῶν,
μηδὲ ξύντροφον ὄμμ' ἔχων
νοσεῖ μὲν νόσον ἀγρίαν.—*Id.* 170.

The "subjective" exposition of μή here is in every way worthy of that other one, μή "involves an hypothesis and indefinite reference."

There now falls to be explained an apparent anomaly of μή, which has occurred as an objection to some, and occasioned difficulty to others. The following quotation is from a communication addressed to the writer by a late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, a Chancellor's Medallist, and an occupant of a chair in a National University. Referring to the passages:—

πάλαι δὲ μὴ παρὼν θαυμάζεται.—*Œd. R.* 289.

Περικλῆς ἑαυτὸν ἐμακάριζεν, ὅτι μηδεὶς Ἀθηναίων μέλαν ἱμάτιον δι' αὐτὸν ἐνεδύσατο.—*Plut.*, p. 186.

—he says,—"In the first case, the evil result is inclusive of μή, while in the second it is exclusive of μή, *i.e.*, in the one case, μή (παρών) negatives what ought to be, while, in the other (ἐνεδύσατο), what ought not to be. This seems to me a difficulty."

Here is the explanation. It is a principle in all law, human and divine, that the man who fails to

do what is right, is equally guilty with him who does what is wrong. The one sins by omission, the other by commission. The peculiar function of μή adapts itself to the expression of this distinction with great beauty and clearness. In the first quotation, Sophocles protests against the omission of a duty (μὴ παρών). In the second, Plutarch protests against (μηδεὶς ἐνεδύσατο) the commission of crimes, which commonly caused citizens to *put on mourning*. In other combinations of μή, this distinction comes out as certainly and conspicuously.

Already three instances of contemplated non-performance of duty have been given above: cases of omission with εἰ μή. It is a constantly-recurring formula, so familiar was the idea to the Greek mind. As many more are given here:—

κεἰ μὴ θέλοι (to obey), πυρωπὸν ἐκ Διὸς μολεῖν
κεραυνόν, ὃς πᾶν ἐξαϊστώσοι γένος.—*Prom.* 667.
σκέψαι δ', ἐὰν μὴ τοῖς ἐμοῖς πεισθῇς λόγοις
οἷός σε χειμὼν καὶ κακῶν τρικυμία
ἕπεισ' ἄφυκτος·—*Id.* 1015.
εἰ δὲ μὴ
λέγω γ' ἐγὼ τἀληθές, ἀξιῶ θανεῖν.—*Œd. R.* 944.

The commission of what is bad is equally certain and conspicuous, as indicated by εἰ μή:—

καὶ ταῦτ' ἂν οὐκ ἔπρασσον, εἰ μή μοι πικρὸς
αὐτῷ τ' ἀρὰς ἠρᾶτο καὶ τῷ 'μῷ γένει.
—*Œd. C.* 951.

The cursing of a brother-in-law is surely the commission of a crime, and to be condemned. In

the next citation the completion of a great disaster is indicated :—

κεἰ μὴ τόδ' ὄμμα καὶ φρένες διάστροφοι
γνώμης ἀπῆξαν τῆς ἐμῆς, οὐκ ἄν ποτε
δίκην κατ' ἄλλου φωτὸς ὧδ' ἐψήφισαν.—*Ajax*, 449.

In the preceding citation, μή indicated the deplorable visitation of madness; in the following it indicates the deplorable visitation of blindness :—

πόλιν μέν, εἰ καὶ (even though) μὴ βλέπεις, φρονεῖς δ' ὅμως,
οἵᾳ νόσῳ ξύνεστιν.—*Œd. R.* 302.

Thus μή, with equal propriety, either condemns the prevalence of what is bad, or deplores the absence of what is good. The operation of this principle is clearly perceptible in another combination of μή. Reference has already been made to οὐ μή. The Greeks, by combining these two particles together, proved that the difference between them was one of degree, not of nature. Those who have said or believed that οὐ expresses fact, while μή expresses conception, are bound to explain where in this combination fact ends, and conception begins. They must do so ere others can believe their doctrine. Herodotus, the father of history, explains the full force of the combination. As Euripides has shown that τὸ μὴ ἔχειν is = κακόν, and Aristophanes considered that ἡ μὴ 'μπειρία was a *bad* thing,—for he has written, Δεινόν ἐστιν ἡ μὴ 'μπειρία ;—*Eccl.* 115 : so Herodotus has written :—

οὐ γὰρ μὴ ἀπώσηται· οὐ γάρ οἱ Θεμις ἐστί.—i. 199.

Liddell and *Scott*, in explaining this combination,

say *οὔ τι μὴ ληφθῶ* is = *οὐ ληφθήσομαι*. If the Greeks had thought so, they would have written so. The peculiar meaning of this combination, as contra-distinguished from the future, with *οὐ* may soon be seen. Of course, as Herodotus has expressly said so in words, *μή* protests against what is bad, and *οὐ* negatives the probability of its occurrence. The striking similarity of sentiment in the following sentences accounts for the similarity of syntax :—

θάρσει τὸ τοῦδέ γ' ἀνδρός. οὔ σε μὴ προδῶ.
—*Œd. C.* 649.

μενεῖς ἄσυλος, κοὔ σε μὴ μεθῶ τινι.—*Med.* 728.

τὸν ἄνδρα' ἐκεῖνον οὔ τι ωὴ λίπω ποτέ.
—*Eum.* 225.

καὶ ἢν νικήσωμεν, οὐ μὴ ποτὲ ὑμῖν Πελοποννήσιοι *ἐς τὴν χώραν ἄνευ τῆς τῶνδε ἵππου ἐσβάλωσι.*—*Thuc.* 495.

ἢν γὰρ ἅπαξ δύο ἢ τριῶν ἡμερῶν ὁδὸν ἀπόσχωμεν, οὐκέτι μὴ δύνηται βασιλεὺς ἡμᾶς καταλαβεῖν.—*An.* ii. 2, 12.

ἵππον δωροῦμαι, ἐφ' οὗ καὶ διώκων ὃν ἂν θέλῃς αἱρήσεις, καὶ ἀναχωρῶν οὐ μὴ δείσῃς τὸν πολέμιον.—*Id.* vii. 3, 26.

The converse combination *μὴ οὐ* is equally clear and conclusive. *Οὐ μή* introduces something to be dreaded as bad, while *μὴ οὐ* introduces something to be desired as good. In the former, *μή* deprecates the presence of what is bad; in the latter, *μή* deplores the absence of what is good :—

οὐ γὰρ ἂν μακρὰν
ἴχνευον αὐτός, μὴ οὐκ ἔχων τι σύμβολον.
—*Œd. R.* 220.

δεδιότες δὲ μὴ οὐδ' οὕτω δύνωνται ὀλίγοι πρὸς πολλοὺς ἀντέχειν.—*Thuc.* ii. 76.

πείσομαι γὰρ οὐ
τοσοῦτον οὐδέν, ὥστε μὴ οὐ καλῶς θανεῖν.—*Ant.* 97.

αἰσχρὸν ἐστι καὶ ἐμοὶ σοφίαν καὶ ἐπιστήμην μὴ οὐχὶ πάντων κράτιστον φάναι εἶναι.—Plato, *Prot.*, p. 352, D.

Thus μή, whether it forbids, deprecates, or denies, either does so because of the existence of something to be dreaded, or the absence of something to be desired:—

Δείδομεν μή ψεύδωνται οἱ κακοί.
Δείδομεν μὴ οὐκ ἀληθεύωσι(ν) οἱ κακοί.

That μή should ever have been supposed to have involved essentially and exclusively an "hypothesis," has arisen from the solitary combination εἰ μή. But, as has been seen, εἰ is also found with the weaker, simpler, colder, more common negative οὐ.

Μή, moreover, as has been seen from almost endless examples above, is used absolutely, definitely, in the statement of historical facts, and thus coincides in its marvellous mechanism with *qui* and the Latin subjunctive:—

πάλαι δὲ μὴ παρὼν θαυμάζεται,

Tiresias jam dudum mihi mirationem movet, *qui non adsit.*

καὶ μὴ παρόντος,
Quum *Socrates* non *adsit.*

Sed nos immensum spatium confecimus aequor,
Et jam tempus equum fumantum solvere colla.

FINIS.

00065012

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 23 January, 2019